THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

VOL. XXXIV. No. 1 JANUARY, 1927

The Fourth Watch of the Night — W. H. Buss — 1

Spreading the Good News — Charles S. Mack — 8

About Our Business — Leslie Marshall — 14

The Appearance of the Lord to Angels, Spirits and Men — S. Chr. Brönniche — 21

Materials for an Estimate of Swedenborg's Historical Position and Influence. III. — Lewis F. Hite — 31

Church and State — William Warren Towle — 52

"Mind as Behavior" [a review of Edgar Arthur Singer's book.] — Lewis F. Hite — 62

V.34 1927

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Place of Philosophy in Religious Teaching LEWIS F. HITE 81

The Heart of the Incarnation's Meaning WM. F. WUNSCH - 90

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

The Vision of the Holy City LEWIS F. HITE - - - - 97

Going About the Deeper Sense of Scripture
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - - 105

Current Literature :

Burton Scott Easton's "The Gospel According to St. Luke"
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - - 109

Bishop Charles Gore's "The Reconstruction of Belief"
AUSTIN WARREN, Ph. D. - - - - - - - - 111

Eldred C. Vanderlaan's "Fundamentalism versus Modernism"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 116

Ernest Gordon's "The Leaven of the Sadducees; or, Old and New Apostacies" B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - 119

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXIV.] JANUARY, 1927 [No. 1

THE FOURTH WATCH OF THE NIGHT

BY THE REV. W. H. BUSS

WHEN we consider the state of things in the religious world at the present time, our New-Church prospects in the midst of it seem, at certain times especially, very poor indeed. Our position is not unlike that of the disciples on the sea of Galilee (Matt. xiv) when they were "toiling in rowing" against contrary winds and a tempestuous sea, with little hope of ever reaching their desired haven. In the fourth watch of the night Jesus came to their relief, walking on the sea. He thereby testified that, notwithstanding the hopeless view of things, He was Master of the situation, and would see to it that no harm came to His ship of the Church, or to its faithful toilers on the sea. He indicates also that He has the hells well under foot; for the winds are influxes from hell's foreign shore, and the tempestuous sea is the troubled state that such an incursion creates, whether in the individual mind or in the Church as a whole. But the Lord does not appear upon the scene until the fourth watch of the night. That is the hour that sees the last of the darkness and, at the same time, the dawn of a new day. It is not that the Lord has been absent until now, but that the disciples do not discern Him until this fourth watch of the night. May we not assume that something like this will occur in the not far distant future?

Let us view the present situation for a moment, and in

doing so we may have reason for believing that some fourth watch of the night for the New Church is near at hand. What we shall probably discern will be that the storms and contrary winds that so vexed the mariners, and showed, through a long period of trial, no signs of abatement, were bound to come and do their worst before it was time for the Lord to appear upon the scene and bring the dawn with Him.

For how have matters stood, and how do they still stand in the world of religion around us? We might suppose that, since the revelations of the New Church have been given to the world, and since also the world of spirits has been cleared by the Last Judgment of a mass of obstruction that previously prevented influx descending from heaven reaching men in this natural world, the course of the Church in the future would be less turbulent than it had been before. But it has not been so. Obstacles to the Church's true progress have been as great as ever, and a degree more complex, if anything. Forces not in existence before have made their appearance since the Last Judgment; obstructions of a new kind have hampered the way of the Church, and they seem rather to increase than diminish as time goes on. The dragon has been cast out, it is true; and the scarlet woman has been dethroned in the world of spirits; but neither Protestantism nor Catholicism in this world seem in the least inclined to alter their doctrines; nor do they seem to even suspect that there is anything the matter with them. It would surely be a blessing if some turn of events should open their eyes, or lead them to suspect that there might be something wrong in the doctrinal direction. But this is not at all likely to happen, since, in the one case, authority has been taken from the Word and vested in the "Church," and in the other, though the Word was once its only court of appeal, that Word has since lost its authority. But with such forces still in the field and apparently holding their own, no wonder that the New Church makes little headway. The mariners must still continue "toiling in

rowing"; and let them do it with stout hearts and lusty sinews till some fourth watch of the night has come. Then signs will appear on their horizon, making it evident that the Lord is present and has been present all along, though they perceived Him not. Perhaps they will then blame themselves for not having trusted Him more while storms were raging; but they are first human, and faith is apt to waver when troubles loom large and occupy their whole attention.

Just here it may be necessary to say that in such a survey as this, and speaking of *disciples,* we ought to have in view not only the true members of the New Church as an outward organization in this world, but many who are at present outside her borders and who are as anxious for the well-being of the Church as we are, and, it may be, a degree more troubled at present omens than we are. We must remind ourselves that those Seven Churches of Asia are not those who are at present in the New Church, but those who will be in it when their present faults and errors have been removed. They are scattered abroad throughout Christendom, we are told; but where they are exactly, no one can say. We might remind ourselves too in passing, that some of those Churches were troubled as much by some within their several borders as by those without—by those who "say they are Jews and are not, but do lie," that is to say, who profess to be of the Church, but who are not. This species of trouble is a source of concern to many Christians outside the pale of the New Church, as indeed it is to many within it; but neither would be concerned if they were not sincere. Other incidents point in the same direction. When, for instance, the Lord appeared to His disciples on the shores of the Sea of Tiberias after His resurrection, and, without exactly saying so, virtually called them afresh to be "fishers of men," He told them to cast the net on the right side of the ship? Why? Because the fish were there. The movement of those fish in one specific direction showed that they needed the Church as much as the Church needed them. The Lord sees to it that

they are brought together. They evidently represent that large element in the Gentile world that would be brought into the Church through the work of the disciples in their particular field; but they were not yet in it. What the disciples had to do was to go on with their work of teaching the new gospel in the spirit of charity; and those who needed it would be brought within the reach of it. When, again, the Lord sent His disciples forth on their first missionary journey (Matt. x), He told them not to go into the way of the Gentiles, and not to enter any city of the Samaritans, but to go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. A literal conception of the Gentiles and Samaritans and their ways and cities is conceivable; but who are these "lost sheep of the house of Israel"? The Lord is speaking parabolically; His words have no geographical intention; it is not the "house of Israel," which might be supposed to mean the Jews in particular, but certain persons whom the Lord designates as "lost sheep"; and such an expression can only be understood spiritually. They are those who are in the good of charity—who cultivate and practice charity in their relations with their fellowmen so far as their religion will allow. But the disciples could not pick them out; they could not possibly know where to find them; indeed it was only the Lord who knew of their existence. The truth is, that the disciples must go on with their mission; and the Lord, again, will see to it that the gospel shall find the sheep, and the sheep find the gospel. Though its message will probably fall on many a deaf ear, it will, nevertheless, find those that it was meant for.

So what with the Seven Churches that are not yet within the walls of the New Jerusalem, though they may be on the way,—what with fish that are making for the ship, but have not yet been caught,—what with sheep who have lost their way through false doctrine, and whom the true gospel has not yet found,—we have a somewhat large contingent that will feel a great relief when some fourth watch of the night arrives, giving evidence of the presence of the Lord

and of His saving help. But if disciples should grow weary, and feel the stress of the storm and the pressure of contrary winds, and express themselves accordingly, it is not to be wondered at; for things in the Christian Church today are truly bewildering, and cause many a mariner to feel at his wit's end. Perplexity, if not despair, is felt, when it is perceived that the Sacred Scriptures are losing, if they have not already lost, all real authority. The voice of science, or rather the theories of science, have far more authority, and receive a readier hearing, than the voices of the Word. The popular Church has been receding and retreating before the advances of science for some time past; and it is still retreating. It is not the strength of science, but the weakness of the Church that is most plainly in evidence; and if she capitulates much more, the world will find no further use for "the Church." For if the Word loses all authority, what foundation is there left for the Church to stand upon? The opinions of this or that man of so-called "light and leading" add nothing to the quelling of the storm. and in most cases only increase the difficulties of the mariners. With the authority of the Word so completely undermined as we now see it to be, men are left free to believe pretty much as they like about its contents; and if they still choose to believe in the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of the Lord as literal facts, they are, of course, free to do so; but the concession is granted with an air that means to say that no one will think much of their intelligence if they do. What has happened of course is, that the whole case for the Divinity of the Word and the Divinity of the Lord has been handed over to the Unitarians. *The Christian World* in its weekly issues makes this pretty clear; and whatever that paper might have stood for at one time, nowadays Unitarianism could hardly wish for a doughtier champion. But perhaps, after all, it is only voicing the private opinions of many, and giving a fairly faithful report of what is in the air at the present time. It is, without a doubt, an anxious time for the toilers on the sea; and well may they

wish for some "fourth watch of the night" that will afford them welcome relief.

But perhaps all this is not so much to be feared as we might at first suppose. It is far better that hidden denials and negations of many kinds lying in the heart of a dying Christianity should come out, than that they should any longer lie concealed. It is better that the Church's utter incompetence to meet the spiritual needs of mankind should be strongly in evidence, than that the mass of men should still nurse delusions, or be put off by a debased theological coinage. The situation is difficult to define accurately; but vagueness is the chief characteristic of the religious atmosphere of today; and so little has the official Church to offer in the way of real instruction, that if the masses are deserting her it may be read as a sign that men's perceptions and common sense are to be trusted after all. Even the widespread indifference of these days may be a not unmixed evil; indeed it may be a sure indication that what the Church has to offer is neither interesting nor serviceable. What seems clear when all things are reckoned up is, that things have got to work themselves out for the former Church's real destitution to appear. It is of the Lord's good Providence that storms and contrary winds shall do their worst till hell's rage has spent itself; and that will be at some "fourth watch of the night," which also will announce the dawning of a new day, and in such a way that disciples will be forced to acknowledge it.

As New-Churchmen we know that the Lord has come again; but that is not evident to all. And it is doubtful whether the evidences of such a coming of the Lord as New-Churchmen now know it to be, will be so welcome as might have been expected to those who have been looking for something different. The Lord's appearance on the sea of Galilee was not by any means a welcome one. They regarded it as an addition to terrors already sufficient in number and in power. When they saw Him they thought He was a spirit, and cried out for fear. And, truly, the

Lord's coming at the present day is so crowded with spiritual-world information that it is not readily received for that very reason. It is clear that He who can walk upon such a sea of confusion and dire portents as now trouble mariners is Master of the situation, and indicates for disciples that He has all power over hell as well as on earth and in heaven. But this cannot be conceded except to the one omnipotent God; and to those who have thought of Him as one of three, this is not so easy to do. In fact such disciples soon discover that they will have to throw all their Old Church notions overboard, and begin again; and this, at first, they are not prepared to do. It is fear rather than joy that takes possession of disciples at first. But when they become more intimate with the true situation, they understand their Lord to say, "Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid."

With this assurance comes confidence and hope. It will be seen that the inner readings and interpretations of the Word according to a definite system takes it clean out of the hands of the higher critics and modern thought, and shows that the Lord has at last "prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof." One by one the shadows of a long, dreary, and toilsome night will pass away from the outlook of faithful disciples; and though toiling in rowing be in the future, the lesson of Peter's experience will not be forgotten. At the Lord's permission he too walked upon the sea, and all went well with him so long as he kept his eyes on the Lord and went straight on; but when he took his eyes off the Lord and paid attention to the boisterous sea, he was afraid, and, of course, began to sink. So, also, the disciples of today make a mistake in paying too much attention to the circumstances around them, and allowing their self-derived intelligence to judge the situation for them; for they are then tempted to despair. The advice plainly is, Keep your eyes on the Lord, and pay no attention to the storm.

W. H. Buss.

Steeton, England.

SPREADING THE GOOD NEWS.*

By the Rev. Charles S. Mack.

A CHURCH spire pointing heavenward suggests the mission of the Church. Whatever methods she adopts for attracting people, or for teaching, the final object of any method should be to win hearts to heaven. That is what the Church exists for; and, so far as she is true to her mission, she looks constantly to the Lord in His Word for guidance, inspiration, protection.

When we read the seventeenth verse of the last chapter in the Bible, there may present itself to our minds a very wonderful picture. The verse is, "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." The picture presented is of Heaven and the Church inviting men to the Word, and of those who respond to the invitation exhorting others to come to the Word—of those who thirst joining the throng pressing on toward the Word, and of all who will coming to the Word, and taking "the water of life freely." The Word as the "pure river of water of life, . . . proceeding out of the throne" (Rev. 22:1)—the Word as the "river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God" (Ps. 46:4), is ever flowing through the minds of angels, and of men on earth, keeping green the pastures in which all beginnings of heavenliness love to lie down (Ps. 23:2), and refreshing every one who would be "like a tree planted by the rivers of water," bringing forth fruit (Ps. 1:3; Rev. 22:2). So we remind ourselves that the mission of the Church, to ourselves and others, is to bring heaven into our hearts and theirs, and into our lives and theirs, by means of the Word. And if we look at the matter aright,

*Address of the Presiding Minister at the Opening of the Eighty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Illinois Association, Chicago, Sept. 17-19, 1926.

nothing can possibly discourage us in our work *for* and *in* the Church. Working *for* the Church, that she may benefit others—supporting her for the sake of others—for the good influence she exerts upon them, is a good and helpful thing to do; but we should work not only *for,* but *in* the Church, our hearts and thoughts wrapped up in her,—the Church in us, and we in the Church.

We find faithfully presented to our minds in the Book of Revelation a picture of folks heeding the invitation of Heaven and the Church to come to the Word—themselves responding, exhorting others to come with them, and all who will together coming to the waters, for the benefit of each and all. The best way to build up the Church is not merely to point out to others the folly of spending "money for that which is not bread" and of laboring "for that which satisfieth not" (Is. 55:2). Our greatest service to the Church lies not in merely pointing out the way to others, and saying "Go." The word for us to use is "Come." "Come, join our happy throng." Let us together heed the invitation of Heaven and the Church to come to the Word. "And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come" (Rev. 22:17). The Lord does not merely point out for us the way to heaven, and then leave us to travel it alone: He walks with us every step of the way: " . . . I will be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee" (Josh. 1:5).

When Philip tells Nathanael of having found Jesus, and Nathanael asks, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Philip saith unto him, "Come and see" (John 1:45, 46). We, present day disciples, in our efforts to add to His following, are not merely to tell folks the way, not merely to give them directions. The ideal is that we bid them "Come and see," and that we press on with them—they to find light in the infinite Word upon their walks in life and their problems, and we to find there light upon ours.

Onward then, ye people,
Join our happy throng,
Blend with ours your voices,
In the triumph song.

If the upward pointing church spire suggests that the mission of the Church is to point to heaven, and lead to heaven, it suggests, too, that the mission of the Church is to point to the Lord, and lead to Him; for all of heaven—all that is heavenly is from Him. In declaring the truth about Jesus Christ to the many—some of them in the churches, some of them out of the churches—who are maintaining altars "To THE UNKNOWN GOD" (Acts 17:23), we of today are meeting opposition less violent than that which was met by those who so faithfully declared that truth—the truth about Jesus Christ—a hundred years or more ago. In the earlier days of the New Church the doctrines of God as tripersonal, and of the vicarious atonement, seemed immovably established; but today those doctrines seem far from stable and secure. The opposition to the truth about Jesus Christ most in evidence today purports to be based upon doctrines of science rather than upon doctrines of the Church. The dawn of the New Age is marked by such unshackling of the faculty of reason that when, declaring the truth about Jesus Christ, we say "Come and see; come to the Word, and drink freely the truth about Jesus Christ," the ear turned to us is perhaps not quite so deaf as was the ear turned to the appeal of the earlier New-Churchmen. Those to whom we say "Come" may reasonably assume that we ourselves have had some experimental knowledge of the truth, to the consideration of which we are exhorting them; that we have tasted and seen that this truth is good (Ps. 34:8). Happy may we be, if they discern in us anything which leads them to "glorify" our "Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16). We cannot doubt that from the beginning which has been made there will be, in practical affairs, such development of the life of the Church that, more and more, people coming into contact with the Church will say with Ruth of old, "Whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God" (Ruth 1:16). You see we are making much of the power of attraction to the Church exerted upon others by us, in so far as we really are

of the Lord's disciples, of those whom He calls "the salt of the earth," "the light of the world" (Matt. 5:13, 14). We really are His disciples only so far as we receive from Him saltness, a love of putting heavenly truths into practice, and transmitting light from Him Who is "the light of the world" (John 8:12). Our message to all men is, "Come and see" (John 1:46). Come with us to the Word—with us learn from the Word—with us look to it for inspiration from heaven into our lives among men, and with us look to its truths for protection from those enemies who would destroy everything heavenly that may be in anyone. Come, taste, experience such benefits as God would bestow upon all, through His Word.

The 122nd Psalm, which we all love, speaks of the peace proper to the Church: "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem . . : Peace be within thy walls, . . . Peace be within thee." Commenting upon these words, the Writings say that

> Charity, spiritual security, and internal rest, are peace; for, when a man is in the Lord, he is in peace with his neighbor, which is charity; in protection against the hells, which is spiritual security; and when he is in peace with his neighbor, and in protection against the hells, he is in internal rest from evils and falsities. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 306.)

This is the peace which the world can neither give nor take away. It is easy to see that the world cannot bestow upon one feelings of heavenly love toward the neighbor, cannot afford protection from spiritual foes, cannot impart internal rest. These can come only through the Church, which essentially is a looking to the Lord and to His Word.

In this 122nd Psalm we sing "Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem." Perhaps no one of us need be told that within these words is expressed a determination that our daily walk shall so accord with the teachings of the Word, that we shall become more and more firmly established in the Church—in a heavenly life. The ideal toward which we strive is that all we feel, think, or do shall tend to the development of heaven in ourselves and in others. The spirit within the Word, and within Provi-

dence, constantly tends toward heaven; and only in the measure that one's spirit is in accord with that spirit can he experience heavenly peace. Very familiar to us all is the fact that the spirit within the Word and within Providence is mercifully covered with a cloud, and that each one is permitted to see just so much of that spirit as it is best he should see, and no more.

The Eastman Kodak Company is endeavoring to perfect a method for photographing through a cloud of smoke or of watery vapor. Published photographs seem to show that the attempt is already somewhat successful; a photograph by ordinary methods showing only the hither side of a cloud, and beside it a photograph by the new method showing the landscape photographed through the cloud. The doctrines of the Church have enabled each of us to see, through the cloud of the letter, something of the spirit within the Word, and within Providences, and something of the spiritual world within nature. As we see more and more of these spiritual realities, our feet should stand more and more firmly "within thy gates, O Jerusalem." More and more of what the upward pointing church spire would keep in our minds, should find expression in our daily walk.

The Church is essential to the continuance of the human race. But for the Church (which essentially is regard for the Lord and the Word) all of man's interests would be centered upon self and nature; and a whole race void of any interest at all centered upon the Lord and heaven, would not be human. That God would bring us out of the Egyptian darkness in which one remains so long as his interests are centered upon self and nature, and would bring us out of bondage to nature only, is taught in the first commandment: "I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." The constant purpose of Providence is to bring individuals, bodies of individuals, the whole race, as rapidly as may be, or as gradually as must be, out of the Egyptian darkness, which light derived from nature only, is; and out of such bondage to nature as precludes cultiva-

tion of the heavenly life. As we grow in realization that that is the constant purpose of Providence, and as we grow more and more into sympathy with that purpose, we shall feel more deeply that the Lord is "holy in all His works" (Ps. 145:17), and that His name should be hallowed; and when we pray that His will be done—whether we are thinking of ourselves individually, or of our families and friends, or of the Church—we shall understand that our prayer is for deliverance from the Egyptian darkness which nature alone would impose upon all, and for deliverance from such bondage to earth as hinders progress toward heaven.

Whether one looks out into the world around him, or looks at the world within him, he may see clearly the necessity for knowledges which nature alone cannot afford, and for relief from domination by mere appearances; he may see the necessity for such light and liberation as the Church is here to afford. Seeing the high and indispensable service which the Church renders, and would render ever more and more efficiently, one may be thankful whenever he discerns an opportunity to serve her better, more devotedly than he has been doing.

The Church is here to bring life where has been deadness —whether in the individual or in the race: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt. 19:17). Whether we think of the development of the Church in the individual, or think of its growth as an organized body in the world, there are of course obstacles to be met and overcome. Think of the Seven Promises to those who overcome, in the Seven Churches in the Book of Revelation. No obstacle overcome, no growth of the Church, whether in the individual, or in the organized Church as a body. Those promises should remind us of how mindful the Lord is of us at all times.

If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy. (Ps. 137: 5, 6.)

CHAS. S. MACK.

ABOUT OUR BUSINESS

By Leslie Marshall

ADDRESSING the Epworth League Assembly at its 1926 annual convention, Dr. C. F. Reisner, New York pastor, and former head of the Department of Religious Advertising in the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, made the statement: "Religion is a business, and should therefore employ advertising."

This is an interesting pronouncement from an authoritative source, but decidedly there is nothing new about it. Churchmen have been talking of advertising and publicity for years. All sorts of plans have been proposed and tried out, but with problematical results.

Probably the recent national "Go-to-Church" campaign, conducted through syndicated Saturday church pages, has been the nearest approach to effective paid advertising; but for the most part the long lists of business men's names attached to the advertisements, with a reference to their support of the campaign, has given a somewhat commercial or selfish air to the plan.

Of course, the Church has always been handicapped in any ambitions it might have in the advertising line, not only by the ethics of the case, but by lack of funds. A business man will spend thousands on the advertising and publicity plans of his company, and his experts will lavish their brains to make the campaign a success; but it is likely that neither money nor ideas will, as a rule, be offered for such a purpose to the churches of which these individuals may be members.

However, even regarding the matter from a professional standpoint, whether religion is a "business" or not, the Church (and the Sunday School) does not need paid publicity nearly as much as it requires useful, unselfish work,

seven days a week, on the part of church members. And, to continue the comparison, the Church is just as ineffective without active executives, "employees," and investing "stockholders," as is the commercial concern. No amount of publicity is of use in such a case. To go even farther back than that, the fact of the matter is that, without a satisfactory brand of "goods" filling everyday needs, there is no demand for the production of the "business."

In consideration of the problems of the New Church, we may have good reasons for thinking that the Church of the New Jerusalem has the "goods"; but the question before us is: Do we "deliver" them? Are we bringing to the attention of ever increasing numbers this pearl of great price, the Heavenly Doctrines? Are we, as the Apostle James admonished, showing our faith by our works?

One thing is sure, we cannot do so without a plan. We cannot do so unless our desire to give far transcends our hope to receive. Both time and money are required; but back of it all, gratitude and enthusiasm.

It seems to me that one vital appeal of the New Church is to the gentiles; to that great body largely composed of those who through dissatisfaction with past church connections, or through lethargy or atheism, have no religious affiliations. By this I mean that the New Church should make every effort to interest that class.

We know that at present our church activities are largely along orthodox lines. The leagues, suppers, men's clubs, etc., while no doubt serving their end, present nothing new to one used to such affairs in the Old Church. In a sense, too, they are insular; more or less confined to the church society's own particular circle.

Uses need to be developed, if I may say so, where the stranger may be reached in a personal way, and then means provided whereby, if he wishes, he may continue his interest. Perhaps the most useful activity along this line is through the public lecture. This is nothing new to the New Church; but the effort along this line has not been a sustained one.

Without question, more people can be reached in this way than in any other. The Christian Scientists, with nearly 25 lecturers, estimated that they reached more than 2,000,000 listeners in 1925.

Gather a body of people in a hall to hear a lecture, and you will be listened to, if your message is worth while. Perhaps the attention will be better than even over the radio. There is the suspicion that many dials are hurriedly turned off, when the average sermon or lecture is broadcasted. A lecture attendance is prolific also of an excellent mailing-list for follow-up purposes.

The plan might be, either for each association to maintain a regular circuit lecturer, or for the entire United States to be covered by one or two speakers. One dollar yearly, a two-cent stamp weekly, from each member of the Convention, would easily finance this important work, which should be planned and routed by a lecture board or committee. Each society or circle would expect to give at least one lecture yearly; the larger churches, two. More interest is manifested in a visiting speaker than in a local man.

An attractive manner of advertising such a lecture would be rather from the standpoint of the subject itself; that is, the standard announcement might rather be "John Jones on Swedenborg," than "John Jones will lecture on the doctrines of the New Church"; or "John Jones on Life Hereafter," rather than a "Lecture Will be Given This Evening at the Church of the New Jerusalem." We have seen some very good announcements and invitations issued by New-Churchmen along the same line as suggested.

Let us say that only one or two individuals have been led to seek for further information on the subject of the lecture, and that these individuals are chary of church attendance. Where will they first turn? Might it not be to a center where the books that deal with their interest are sold or loaned? If business people, it would be very convenient if such a place were provided downtown, where one might even go for study.

In such cases particularly is the use of a book-room or loan library manifested. How splendid it would be if each society of the New Church provided such a center! The expense is not great. In the average size society the need could hardly be more than twenty-five cents weekly per member. Where a paid attendant is not possible, the staff in charge could consist of a committee of ladies, and we hasten to add, such a room should be open all day, every day in the week, except holidays and Sundays.

We venture to say there is no other church organization in the world that can stock a sales-room or library with a selection of books dealing with so wide a range of subjects as can the New Church. If our offerings were confined to the writings of a single writer (as is, for instance, the case with the Christian Scientists,—excepting the Bible and their periodicals), or if on a single theme (as is the case with, say, the New-Thought people), there might be some reason for lack of popular and general appeal. But here we are with a tremendous range of literature, perhaps unparalleled in its class; so at least a New York librarian once informed our Mr. Lathbury, and the statement is well founded.

Our present splendid publishing societies and book depots are doing remarkable work in the distribution of our literature throughout the world; but the local individual effort is required, not only for the public, but to lend added force and encouragement for work among our own church membership. Besides the sales-room, a loan library could be provided with a certain amount of space arranged with tables for study purposes. If the room or store had a street frontage, there would be even greater possibilities for contact with the public, and much useful work could be accomplished by way of answering questions.

It will be remembered that in the building of the Ark the Israelites "came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing, and they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the tabernacle." It is by the work of "every one" that results are made manifest.

We cannot all be ministers, or lecturers, or book-room attendants; but there are many other avenues for individual service beside those offices or the usual committees of the society.

For example, literature distribution work does not seem to be a general use. This plan includes the gathering up from the membership of used copies of the church periodicals. Art gum removes all soiled spots; and then this literature is re-distributed to those places or individuals where it is welcomed. The jails, county institutions, and hospitals, are customary stations; while a mailing-list can be provided for with little expense. In New York and other sea-ports, there is ever a hungry demand for reading matter among the seamen, through their missions or directly aboardship.

The Wayside Pulpit plan, as recently explained by the New-Church Press, is a splendid publicity medium. If not already considered by the religious advertising committee of the Associated Advertising Clubs, it could be usefully included in that body's program. Texts pointing to the application of religion to everyday affairs appear to have the most popular and general appeal. The matter of keeping these "pulpits" in good condition might be the most difficult question. The local church society concerned would probably have a standing committee in charge of the plan.

More general use of the parish paper is something to be considered. These publications have probably been confined to the larger church societies in the past, for the reason that to the smaller groups the expense of production has seemed prohibitive. Also, the time to be given to making-up each issue has been a serious obstacle. But there is now at least one well-known concern which makes a specialty of producing parish papers at moderate cost. All that is required of the local body is a certain amount of parish news and the copy for the advertisements. This matter is then all set into forms already prepared. If the local society does not care to produce its own sermon, or topics, the producing house will care for that, too. Income from ad-

vertisements should easily cover the cost of several hundred papers under this plan. There has been some consideration of the production, for any societies desiring it, of a high-grade parish paper by the New-Church Book Center in Philadelphia.

In nearly every society will be found an individual with a talent and liking for "writing." An excellent outlet for such ability is by way of the "Letters to the Editor" column, maintained by practically all newspapers. The universality of Swedenborg's genius makes such a task particularly feasible, as well as most interesting. Scarcely a day goes by but that there is something in the news upon which the Heavenly Doctrines throw light. Tactfully and simply presented, with not more than one reference to Swedenborg by name, such communications are invariably acceptable. The truths thereby presented must necessarily have a constructive and interest-fostering influence.

Now all the things to which we have referred need expenditure of time and money; but in a sense both are secondary. And if this seems like a paradox, let us consider the Apostle Peter, who, importuned by the lame man at the gate called Beautiful, declared, "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk."

This leads us to a brief consideration of the question of spiritual healing of physical disorders as a use in our Church, and the place it would seem to have in quickening an interest among the public in our teachings. We are taught, "Man cannot be regenerated while in a state of sickness." This seemed to me "a hard saying" when first noted. But then we go on to read, that man cannot be regenerated unless in a state of freedom; and that sick states are necessarily compulsive. That is, the approach or consideration of death brings on a desire, apparently external, for regeneration, rather than an examination of self to that end, and the realization that "Sins must be shunned as sins against God." Therefore, is a sick man to be sent

to drugs to cure his disability; or is he to be pointed to the need and desire for regeneration, if he would be well? Inasmuch as "Disease corresponds to the lusts and passions of the mind," it follows that it is the removal of those erroneous spiritual conditions which results in an harmonious natural state.

Gibbon records that the greatest growth of the Christian Church was coincident with the continuance of healing through spiritual means, as practiced by the Apostles under the instruction of the Lord. With what we deem to be the corruption of the Church by Constantine, there came an almost total cessation of this habit of looking to the Lord "Who healeth all thy diseases," and a consequent weakening of the Church on earth. It is self-evident that all the medicine in the world will not redeem or regenerate a man; whereas pointing the sick to the Word in time of trouble, whether of body or soul, emulates the beautiful rule of Peter who sought his help "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth."

In conclusion, it must be apparent to all of us that the problem of the growth and progress of the New Church organization rests squarely with the individual members. It was pointed out in rather an interesting way by an editorial appearing in *The Railroad Trainman* for August, 1926, that the reason for the languishment of the union labor movement is, that "Instead of the membership having an important part in the work of the organization, all the work is placed in the hands of the few." Whenever this tendency raises its hydra head, any organization goes backward.

How distinctive and how beautiful is our teaching of uses! How vitally important, too, when we remember the Master's encouragement to greater effort in His words, "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few; Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest."

LESLIE MARSHALL.

THE APPEARANCE OF THE LORD TO ANGELS, SPIRITS AND MEN

By the Rev. S. Chr. Brönniche

THAT the Lord, the God of the universe, is able to manifest Himself and appear to His creatures, is what we must accept; for if He were not able to do so, how then could He be God? He would thus lack a very essential characteristic of Divinity, and would be less perfect than man; as a human father may both manifest himself and appear to his children. But how the Lord is able to make Himself known to man in the life to come as well as in the world—how He may appear to him and speak to him, though infinite and incomprehensible as He is in Himself—was not clearly understood before the light of the New Church was thrown upon the subject. In this light we may see that, after the full glorification of the Humanity which the Lord assumed in the world, He can only appear to the spiritual sense of man in the spiritual sphere of life; as was also the case before His Incarnation. This is, however, not something that makes His appearance less real or living to us; for, on the contrary, the more interior a thing is or the more spiritual, the more real and living it is.

During His Incarnation the Lord appeared to men on earth not only in a clothing borrowed from the spiritual world (He possessed beforehand the two higher degrees, the celestial and the spiritual); He also appeared in a clothing taken from the sphere of life in which we live, the natural degree, the fixed substances of matter which enabled Him to be seen by the material eyes of men (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 233). But at the same time He appeared in the inner and spiritual sphere of life in a Humanity as seen by the three Apostles on the mount where He was

"transfigured," as it is expressed in the Gospel; for He was then seen by their spiritual eyes, and according to the conceptions of the Apostles and of the angels with whom they communicated.

After the resurrection the Lord also appeared in the same way as He did to angels and good spirits, showing Himself to the disciples according to their particular states of mind. In one case He was believed to be a gardener; and in another He seems to have appeared with the prints of the nails in His hands and feet. When He left the disciples, ascending into heaven, a cloud took Him away from their wondering eyes—as it is said in the Acts of the Apostles.

We also know that He was seen by the Apostle John on Patmos, but as the Son of Man, and representing the Word; and later on in the Apocalypse we learn of His appearing in a different way, as by an angel who instructs John, saying: "I Jesus, have sent my angel"; while shortly after the same angel calls himself the fellow-servant of John. This manifestation of the Lord to man in the world is the latest one of which we hear in that part of the Bible which makes the Word itself.

As the Lord is in Himself, He is entirely above the conception of any man, spirit, or angel. In the words of the Gospel of John we read, "No one has ever seen the Father"; and in the book of Moses we read, "No one can see God and live." But He can be seen and approached in His assumed Humanity, or in His revelation to creatures, always veiling Himself or accommodating Himself to the particular state in which the one to whom He appears is. He therefore cannot be seen but in a human form like that of an angel, a spirit, or a man. This is the most perfect way in which His life may present itself to the eye.

In the spiritual world, says Swedenborg,

> All things are appearances of the wisdom . . . and of the perception of the loves of the angels . . . which is the reason why they are only the objects of their thoughts and affections (Divine Wisdom, posthumous, VII, 5[2]).

This also applies to the way in which the Lord appears to angels, spirits, and men.

> [He] appears to every one according to his quality (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6832).

It is also the reason why the Lord "although everywhere in the heavens with the angels, nevertheless appears high above them" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 10).

Swedenborg speaks of the Lord God as Man—not as a man, as it is often translated; and he also uses the expression "person" about Him, but with a spiritual conception of the term. He thus says:

> God Himself is man . . . therefore when the Lord manifests Himself to the angels in Person, He manifests Himself as man (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 97).

According to Swedenborg, in the spiritual world a teacher told his disciples as follows:

> Think of God from Essence and from this of His Person, and not from Person, and from this of Essence; for to think from Person about Essence, is to think materially even about Essence, whereas to think from Essence about Person, is to think spiritually even about Person.

In the work on the "Divine Love" (posthumous) Swedenborg also writes:

> In the spiritual idea man is not a person, but a use; for a spiritual idea is devoid of the idea of person, . . . and therefore, when one sees another in heaven, he does not indeed see him [or perhaps rather "look upon him"] as a man, but thinks of him as a use (XII e).

Elsewhere we read:

> In the spiritual world there is presence according to the love. Therefore the Lord is omnipresent and does not move. He is in place, but not by means of place, and in space and existence, but not by their means (Invitation to the New Church, II).

According to what is said in other places, the Lord is not "in heaven among the angels" in the same way in which an

angel is there, or in the same way in which "a king is in his kingdom"; for

If He were among the angels in heaven He could not have the universe under His gaze and under His care and government (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 103; Divine Providence, n. 31).

In another place Swedenborg says about the Lord's presence that

Such as it is in itself or in its essence, not any angel and still less any man can sustain it (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 465).

He also states that

By seeing the face of God . . . is not meant to see His face, because no one can see His face as He is in His Divine Love and in His Divine Wisdom, and live; for He is the Sun of heaven and of the whole spiritual world: for to see His face, as He is in Himself, would be as if one should enter into the sun by whose fire he would be consumed in a moment (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 938).

When asked by spirits from another earth how the Lord appears among the angels from our earth, Swedenborg said:

He appears in the sun as man encompassed there with a solar fiery sphere, from which the angels have all light in the heavens (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10809).

In another place it is said:

As no man can be conjoined with the Lord as He is in Himself, therefore He appears to the angels at a distance as a Sun, but still He is in the whole angelic heaven as the soul in man, and in like manner in every society of heaven and in every angel therein (Divine Providence, n. 162).

The distance is, however, only an appearance; for we read:

The Lord is in an angel and an angel in the Lord. . . . But because it appears as if the Lord as a sun were outside him, it also appears that the Lord sees him from the sun, and that he sees the Lord almost in the same manner as an image appears in a mirror (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 125).

The fact is that

As to sight He is above them in the sun there, but as to the life of their love and wisdom He is in them (Divine Providence, n. 31).

This is very important to remember. Still the sun of the spiritual world is not the Lord Himself, as Swedenborg also tells us, the things that constitute that sun being "from the Lord," and "they are therefore not life in itself but are devoid of life in itself" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 294).

Still, it is stated elsewhere:

The essence of this sun is pure love, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who is God of heaven and earth and is one with God the Father, is in the midst of it (Five Memorable Relations, n. 17).

Among the things I especially want to make precise is that the angels and spirits do not all see the sun of heaven in the same way, and that spirits—at least spirits from our earth—never see that sun. Thus in the "Arcana Cœlestia" we read:

The Lord appears to every one according to his quality, . . . to those who are in the inmost or third heaven [He appears] as a sun; . . . to those in the middle or second heaven [He appears] as a moon; . . . but in the first or ultimate heaven the Lord does not appear as a sun nor as a moon, but only as light (n. 6832).

In another passage we are told that

The angels of the third heaven see it [the sun] constantly, the angels of the second heaven very often, and the angels of the first or ultimate heaven, sometimes (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 85).

With those to whom He appears

The presence of the Lord is effected through influx, and the influx is according to the life of good and truth (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9682).

This point we may again confirm by quoting from the work on "Heaven and Hell":

When the Lord manifests Himself in any society, He appears there according to the quality of the good in which the society is, and thus not the same in one society as in another. Not that this dissimilitude is in the Lord, but in those who see Him from their own good, thus according to it. The angels are affected also at the sight of the Lord according to the quality of their love (n. 55).

In the same work it is also stated that "with the angels He is in His own"; and that

The perception of the Lord's presence is in their interiors from which the eyes see, and thus they see Him out of themselves, because there is continuity. Hence it is evident in what way it is to be understood that the Lord is in them and they in the Lord (n. 147).

We are also informed that

Thought itself makes presence; for he who is being thought of appears as if present before the internal sight. In the other life this takes place actually; for when anyone is thought of intensely, he is presented present (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6893).

About the Lord's manifestation in person, Swedenborg writes:

When the Lord manifests Himself to the angels in person, He manifests himself as Man, and this sometimes in the sun and sometimes out of it (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 97).

When the Apostle John, while in Patmos, saw "an angel standing in the sun," it was thus representative of the Lord Himself in His Divine Humanity; for, as we are taught,

No angel appears in the sun; the Lord alone is in it (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 831).

To spirits of the earth Mercury, we are told,

The sun of the spiritual world according to a promise made once appeared, and in the midst of it the Lord encompassed with a solar circle. Seeing this the spirits of Mercury humbled themselves profoundly and sank down. Then also the Lord from the sun appeared to spirits of this earth [Mercury] who, when they were men, had seen Him in the world, of whom one after another, and then in succession, acknowledged that it was the Lord Himself; and this before all the assembly (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 7173).

We also read:

He Himself [the Lord] in the sun is man.—He is our Lord Jesus Christ both as to the Divine from which, and as to the Divine Human (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 961).

When out of the sun, the Lord always appears *per*

aspectum, or by aspect; that is to say, He fills an angel with His spirit,—the angel in the very moment believing that he is the Lord. This is evident from the following passages:

The Lord sometimes presents Himself to be seen out of the sun, but then He veils Himself and presents Himself to the sight, which is done by means of an angel, as He also did in the world before Abraham, Hagar . . . and others, wherefore those angels are called angels and also Jehovah, for the presence of Jehovah was in them from afar (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 938).

He [the Lord] appears in the heavens and below the heavens as an angel when He manifests Himself, filling some angel with His Divine accommodated to the reception of those to whom He gives to see Him (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 465).

The Lord does appear to the angels in heaven, but then it is under an angelic form; for He fills an angel with His own aspect and thus with His presence afar off, and this in various places, but everywhere accommodated to the good of love and faith with those to whom He appears (Apocalypse Explained, n. 412).

Speaking of how the Lord "shows Himself more fully present in a heaven" with the effect that "the pious who are beneath the heaven begin to lament and to be tortured," Swedenborg continues:

The Lord Himself does not descend but an angel with the sphere of love from the Lord about him.

As to the effect on the angel this filling of him by the Lord may have, we are told that

Sometimes the Lord so fills an angel with His Divine that the angel does not know that he is not the Lord (Divine Providence, n. 96).

It is, however, not only angels but also spirits who in this way may be filled by the Lord:

How spirits are filled with the Divine from the Lord by aspect has also been shown. The spirit filled with the Divine knows no other than that he is the Lord and that it is the Divine that speaks, and thus even until he has done speaking; but afterwards he perceives and acknowledges that he is a spirit, and that he did not speak from himself, but from the Lord,—such was the state of the

spirits who spoke with the prophets, therefore also it is said by them that Jehovah spoke (Heaven and Hell, n. 254).

[To this may be added that in a similar way] one spirit can also be filled by another (Divine Providence, n. 96).

We are also informed that:

When the Lord is seen in heaven, which often happens, He is not seen encompassed with the sun but in angelic form, distinguished from the angels by the Divine which shines from His face; for He is not there [in heaven] in person, since the Lord in person is always encompassed with the sun. He is present there by aspect; as it is common in heaven for persons to be seen as present in the place where their view is fixed or terminated, although it may be very far from the place where they really are. This presence is called the presence of the internal light (Heaven and Hell, n. 121).

It is interesting here to note that Swedenborg illustrates the appearance of the Lord in heaven by aspect, mentioning a similar phenomenon, that of presence by internal sight, though in the case of the Lord's manifestation it is done by means of an angel, distinguished from the other angels in the way just quoted.

From what has been adduced in regard to the Lord's presence and appearance by aspect, we see that this takes place by means of an angel just as when He appeared to the churches before His Incarnation, thus appearing "under an angelic form" by "filling some angel with His presence," and according to the particular state of reception with those to whom he manifests Himself.

But this is not the only way in which He may now appear; for since His glorification, when the Humanity He assumed in the world was made Divine, He may also appear in this to finite eyes according to the capacity of the angel, good spirit, or man that sees Him,—in that case He is seen above the heaven and in the very sun.

Speaking of the Second Coming of the Lord, and His appearing to men of the world, Swedenborg declares:

The Lord is not to appear in person [that is to say, not in the flesh as in His first coming] because since He ascended into heaven

He is in the glorified Humanity, and in this He cannot appear to any man unless He first opens the eyes of his spirit, and this cannot be done with anyone who is in evil and thence in falsities (True Christian Religion, n. 777).

That the Lord did reveal Himself to Swedenborg by means of an angel manifestly appears from what he himself declares on the subject, and as early as August 30, 1748, he writes:

It happened several times that I did not think other than the Lord Himself was present and spoke, but the matter stands thus. It is the Lord who thus appears here, through others, who are on that occasion not themselves; and the same likewise imagine that they are the Lord. This thought inflows into the thought of him with whom He is, since he is nothing, and the Lord through him then appears in his form; for his form still remains, as I could plainly perceive this day. The Lord does not wish to change wholly the forms or dispositions of another, and so appear through another. Thus also the Lord speaks through another (Spiritual Diary, n. 2990).

The appearance of the Lord to Swedenborg in 1744 thus seems to have been by aspect or by filling an angel with His presence; and several similar cases may be mentioned; while at other occasions the interior light of Swedenborg was "so far opened" that he plainly saw "the Lord's Divine sphere shining like a moon," while it was "not yet given" him to see the sun, as he expressed it in the "Arcana Cœlestia" (n. 1531); but later on he also saw the sun. In one of his Memorable Relations he writes:

One morning as I awakened from sleep the sun of the spiritual world appeared to me in its splendor, and under it I saw the heavens distant as the earth from the sun (True Christian Religion, n. 135).

In another place he describes this sun, saying:

It was seen by me and it appeared of the same size as the sun of the material world, . . . also fiery like it, only more brilliant (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 85).

In one of his testimonies touching his call he declares:

The Lord alone has taught me, who has been revealed to me,

and afterwards, as the sun, in which He is, has continually appeared and does appear before my eyes, as He appears to the angels, and has given enlightenment (Divine Providence, n. 135).

It is not here expressedly said that Swedenborg also saw the Lord Himself in the sun, as did the spirits of Mercury mentioned above, and I am not aware that he ever says so in his Writings. But he did see the Lord "in person," just as the angels do,—a manifestation which he considered "better than all miracles" (Invitation to the New Church, n. 43); and accordingly he says, alluding to the Second Advent of the Lord, that it is "effected by means of a man before whom He has manifested Himself in person," evidently speaking of himself. He did also see the Lord "in an angelic form out of the sun, a little beneath the sun at a great altitude, and also near at hand in a similar form, with a resplendent countenance,"—also "in the midst of angels as a flame-like radiance" (Heaven and Hell, n. 121).

S. Chr. Brönniche.

Copenhagen, Denmark.

MATERIALS FOR AN ESTIMATE OF SWEDENBORG'S HISTORICAL POSITION AND INFLUENCE. III.

With Notes and Comments by the Rev. Lewis F. Hite

IN the last two issues of the Review we have presented the testimony of certain of Swedenborg's contemporaries concerning him: first, that of a number of Englishmen who were his friends during his final visit to that country; next, that of some of his own countrymen who knew him more or less intimately. In this issue we shall hear what other European acquaintances said about him by way of personal tribute,—first, a Dane.

General Christian Tuxen (1713-1792), to whom we are indebted for the preservation of the letters of Count Höpken quoted from in our last issue, made Swedenborg's acquaintance about the year 1768. His testimony is valuable for the personal glimpses of Swedenborg in his old age,—during the last four years of his life, in fact. It should be borne in mind, however, that General Tuxen was himself an old man (seventy-seven) at the time of writing these letters; and that he wrote twenty years after the events took place. Allowance must be made, therefore, for confusion and lapses of memory, which account for some inconsistencies and some questionable statements. Otherwise he is an intelligent and highly credible witness. His impressions are evidently reproduced faithfully; and his opinions are those of a well informed, educated man, of much public and social experience. His official position, as Commissary General and Inspector of Customs at Elsinore, Denmark, brought him in contact with men prominent in public and social life, and enabled him to view men and events in the light of a man of large affairs and large acquaintance. The Nordenskjöld brothers busied themselves

between the years 1780 and 1790 collecting materials for a biography of Swedenborg. At the request of Augustus Nordenskjöld, General Tuxen furnished, along with the Höpken letters and other valuable material, the following letter. It begins with the circumstances which led to his making Swedenborg's acquaintance, and refers to the stories he had heard about Swedenborg's supernatural powers. These stories aroused his curiosity. Learning that Swedenborg often passed Elsinore in his travels to and from Amsterdam and London, he arranged to meet him at the house of the Swedish Consul. After such introductory matters, the letter continues as follows:

Letter from General Tuxen to Augustus Nordenskjöld (1790):*

"I requested his permission to ask him a few questions. To this he answered civilly and mildly, 'Ask what you please; I shall answer in all truth.' My first question was, Whether the relation, reported as having passed between himself and the Queen at Stockholm, was true. He answered, 'Tell me in what manner you have heard it related, and I will tell you what part of it is true or otherwise.' I replied that, as I saw he was on the point of going aboard the vessel, I supposed there was no time to lose; and I therefore desired that he would have the kindness to relate the affair to me. He consented, and told it to me in the same manner as I had been informed of it before by means of letters from people of credit; adding, however, the following circumstances [thereupon we have apparently

Bibliographical Note.—The following letter is taken from *The New Jerusalem Magazine*, 1790, Appendix, pp. 257-265. It was apparently translated from the original Danish by Augustus Nordenskjöld for that periodical. From this it was inserted by Dr. J. F. I. Tafel in his German edition of the "Swedenborg Documents"; and it was also introduced, in part, into the English editions of the Documents. In this form also it was used, with some alterations, by Dr. R. L. Tafel for his collection of "Documents Concerning Swedenborg" (vol. 2, pp. 430-440).

the most authentic version of the story of 'The Queen's Secret'] . . .

"In the course of further conversation with him on this system of religion, I took an opportunity of asking him, how a man who was confident that he was serious in his duty towards God and his neighbor, could be certain whether he was on the right road to salvation or not. I was answered, that this was very easy; and that such a man need only examine himself and his own thoughts according to the Ten Commandments: as, for instance, whether he loves and fears God; whether he is happy at the welfare of others, and does not envy them; whether on having received a great injury from others, which may have excited him to anger and to meditate revenge, he afterwards changes his sentiments, because God has said that vengeance belongs to Him, and so on; then he may rest assured that he is on the road to heaven: but when he discovers himself to be actuated by contrary sentiments, on the road to hell. . . .

"Some time afterwards, Swedenborg for the last time being on his passage for Amsterdam and London [1770], I was informed that, on account of a contrary wind, he was detained four days on board a Swedish ship anchored a few miles from Elsinore. I therefore took a boat and went off to see him. On my inquiring whether Assessor Swedenborg was on board, the Captain answered in the affirmative, bid me welcome, and opened the cabin door, which as soon as I entered he shut after me.

"I found the Assessor seated in an undress, his elbows on the table, his hands supporting his face which was turned towards the door, his eyes open and much elevated. I was so imprudent as immediately to address him, expressing my happiness at seeing and speaking with him. At this he recovered himself; for he had really been in a trance of ecstacy, as his posture evinced. He rose with some confusion, advanced a few steps from the table in a singular and visible uncertainty (expressed by his countenance and hands), from which, however, he soon recovered, bid me

welcome, and asked me whence I came. I answered that, as I had heard he was on board a Swedish ship lying below the Koll, I was come with an invitation from my wife and self to favor us with his company at our house. He immediately consented, pulled off his gown and slippers, put on clean linen, and dressed himself as briskly and alertly as a young man of one and twenty. He told the Captain where he was to be found when the wind should prove favorable, and accompanied me to Elsinore. Here my wife . . . was waiting to welcome him, and to request his excuse if in any respect our house should fall short of our wishes to entertain him, adding that she had for these thirty years past been afflicted with a violent hysterical disease, which occasioned her much pain and uneasiness. He very politely kissed her hand, and answered, 'Oh dear! of this we will not speak. Only acquiesce in the will of God; it will pass away, and you will arrive at the same health and beauty as when you were fifteen years of age.' . . . We then conversed on the various kinds of pains she had suffered. Afterwards he said, among other things, that for twelve years past he had been afflicted with a very weak stomach, and during that time had scarcely taken any other food than coffee and biscuits.

"I do not recollect on what occasion he told me that the King had issued a circular letter to all the constitutions in Sweden to send the subject of their complaint against his writings and explanations in religion; and that the King, the last time he spoke with him on that head, familiarly laid his hand on his shoulder and said, 'They will not make me any reply, although I have demanded their explicit answers.' . . .

"On my observing here that it was impossible for me to remove space and time from my thoughts in reading his writings, he answered, 'That I easily believe; it also took me some time before I could do it; but I will show and teach you in what manner it may be done.' On this he entered upon a very ample and rational explanation, but

was interrupted by a person coming from the Swedish merchant to invite him to dinner. As we went out, I had no opportunity of conversing with him until he returned from his visit. Being then together, in company with my wife, my now deceased daughter, and three or four young ladies, my relations, he entertained them very politely, and with much attention, on indifferent subjects,—on favorite dogs and cats that were in the room, which caressed him and jumped on his knee showing their little tricks. During these trifling discourses, mixed with singular questions all of which he obligingly answered whether they concerned this world or the other, I mentioned once that I was very sorry that I had no better company to amuse him with than a sickly wife and her young girls. He replied, 'And is not this very good company? I was always very partial to ladies' company.'

"This led me jocosely to ask him whether he had ever been married. . . . He answered, No; but that once in his youth he had been on the road to matrimony, King Charles XII having recommended the famous Polheim to give him his daughter. On my asking what obstacle had prevented it, he replied, 'She would not have me, as she had promised herself to another person to whom she was more attached.' . . .

"After some little pause he cast his eyes on a harpsichord, and asked whether we were lovers of music, and who played upon it. I told him we were all lovers of it, and that my wife in her youth had practised it, as she had a fine voice, perhaps better than any other in Denmark, as several persons of distinction who had heard the best singers in France, England, and Italy, had assured her; and that my daughter also played with pretty good taste. On this, Swedenborg desired her to play. She then performed a difficult and celebrated sonata, to which he beat the measure with his foot on the sofa on which he sat; and when finished, he said, 'Bravo! very fine.' She then played another by Ruttini; and when she had played a few minutes, he said, 'This is by

an Italian, but not the first.' This finished, he said, 'Bravo! you play very well. Do you not also sing?' She answered, 'I sing, but have not a very good voice, though fond of singing; and I would sing, if my mother would accompany me.' He requested my wife to join, to which she assented; and they sang some Italian duettos and some French airs, each in their respective taste, to which he beat time; and he afterwards paid many compliments to my wife on account of her taste and fine voice, which she had preserved notwithstanding so long an illness. . . .

"After this he retired; and while preparing for rest, I took occasion when we were alone to ask him whether there were any in Sweden who approved and relished his system of theology, and whether he could mention any to me. To which he answered, Yes, but few; and he would willingly mention them to me, but that probably I did not know them. I replied, It might happen I knew some one or other. He then named a few bishops and some senators; among others he mentioned the celebrated minister and senator, Count Andrew Höpken, of whom he spoke favorably. . . .

"After the death of Swedenborg I embraced an opportunity of writing to this eminent man, and putting several questions to him. He did not answer directly, yet very politely sent me the four letters hereunto subjoined, all of which are attested copies. [These are the letters quoted from in our last issue.] They give a faithful account of our late benefactor, and in truth not only ours but that of all mankind, if they are seriously solicitous about their future state after death. For my part, I thank the Lord, the God of heaven, that I have been acquainted with this great man and his writings. I esteem this as the greatest blessing I ever experienced in my life, and hope I shall profit by them in working out my salvation.

"My valued guest afterwards took his coffee with a few biscuits, and I accompanied him on board the vessel. Here he took his leave of me in a very affectionate manner, and

I hope I shall in the other life testify to him my grateful heart.

"This to the best of my recollection is all that passed between us, and of which my dear friend [Augustus Nordenskjöld, to whom this letter was written], according to his request, may print whatever he pleases, and leave out what he thinks of less consequence or use; and may rest assured, I shall always regard it as an honor and happiness to be

His most obliged friend and servant,

CHRISTIAN TUXEN."

"Elsinore, May 4, 1790.

"P.S. I may still add what I believe I have before told you concerning myself, namely, that in my childhood and youth I was religiously brought up by my parents [here he mentions his religious education, his drift into infidelity, and especially his reading of Voltaire] . . . In my riper years, reading on a time some things in Voltaire's *Dictionaire Philosophique*, I put it by, and never afterwards looked into it on account of his seducing and specious criticisms, all parts of which we find resolved and refuted by the explication of the Internal Sense of the Word in the writings of our late great friend. These confirmed me in my own ideas respecting the Last Judgment, which agreed with what he teaches on that subject.

"I confess, when I first began to read his Works and just cast my eye on the following passage, that 'a horse signifies the understanding of the Word,' I found myself as it were repulsed and not very well pleased; but afterwards when I read his Works in a series from the beginning, and with attention, though I found many things which surpassed my understanding and knowledge, yet happily I recollected at the same time the answer of Socrates to the other Athenian philosophers, who asked his opinion on the writings of Heraclitus, viz.: That he did not understand them everywhere, but what he did understand was so excellent and good, that he did not doubt that the rest, which he under-

stood not, was equally so. This encouraged me to read more and more, and what I understood, I found for my own advantage; and it appears to me that no system of divinity is more worthy of the dignity of God or more consolatory to man; and, by the Divine help, I will always retain this thought in my mind until I can be convinced that any part thereof is either contrary to the Word and Scriptures of God, or to sound reason.

"I once asked the Assessor whether there were any, and how great a number of persons, whom he knew in this world to favor his doctrine. He answered, not many yet that he knew of, yet he might compute their number to perhaps fifty or thereabouts; and in proportion the same number in the world of spirits."

Aside from the charming picture the above letter gives of Swedenborg in social life, it is authority for Swedenborg's views on several interesting points: How a man can tell when he is on the road to heaven, or on the road to hell; on the difficulty of removing space and time from the thoughts; and the number of those who had accepted his theology at the time in question.

General Tuxen's own appreciation of Swedenborg's greatness, his gratitude for the benefits received from him and from his writings, and especially the account of the difficulties he encountered in trying to understand the exposition of the spiritual meaning of the Bible, are all valuable contributions to an historical estimate of Swedenborg.

For our next witness we turn again to Sweden: to Carl Robsahm, who was treasurer of the bank in Stockholm, and was well acquainted with Swedenborg for a number of years during the latter part of his life, as also with the social circle in which he moved.

Swedenborg, it seems, maintained very friendly relations with his bankers; and he had a banker in each of the several large cities where he spent much time. Besides Robsahm in Stockholm, there were Peter Hammerberg in Gottenburg, Anton and Johan Grill in Amsterdam, Anders and Charles

Lindegren in London, and others, with whom he had friendly personal relations, both business and social.

Robsahm was another of those who were solicited by the Nordenskjölds for authentic information about Swedenborg. In reply, he gives his impressions and opinions, together with a circumstantial account of Swedenborg's habits and home life, which fills out the picture of the man in some more than usual detail. The communication of seventeen large octavo pages, dated March 29, 1782, was sent to Charles F. Nordenskjöld, and consequently was written ten years after Swedenborg's death. It is important to take this into account in a critical comparison of this with other semi-authentic documents.

FROM ROBSAHM'S MEMOIRS OF SWEDENBORG:*

"The late Assessor Emanuel Swedenborg, who by his works became so celebrated throughout Europe, died in

**Bibliographical Note.*—As a matter-of-fact report of impressions and opinions the following account is no doubt in the main reliable, and it appears to be the original source of much of the material that has passed current in the subsequent biographies of Swedenborg. C. F. Nordenskjöld, for whom it was in the first instance written, made it the basis of the material he furnished Anton Joseph Pernety, librarian at Berlin, who used it in the introduction to his French translation of Swedenborg's "Heaven and Hell"; through Nordenskjöld it was also drawn upon by the editor of the *New Jerusalem Magazine* for the "Life of Swedenborg" which appeared in the early numbers (1790). The manuscript fell into the possession of Dr. Achatius Kahl, and was translated by him for Dr. J. F. I. Tafel, who published it in his German "Documents." Finally Dr. Kahl presented the manuscript to Dr. R. L. Tafel, who translated it for the first time into English, and published it in his collection of the "Documents," where it appears as here given in part (for full account see vol. 1, pp. 31-48). "The Anecdotes Collected by Mr. Robsahm," published in the English edition of the "Documents" by the Rev. J. H. Smithson, and in the American edition by the Rev. George Bush, was based upon the material furnished by C. F. Nordenskjöld to Pernety and to the editor of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*. Through these several means, directly and indirectly, the "Robsahm Memoirs" reached the public, and was the source of the material of various biographies.

London, on March 29, 1772, in his eighty-fifth year. A well merited eulogium was pronounced upon him in the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, on October 7, 1772. But posterity may perhaps be interested in knowing that which characterized this noble man at home, and in his intercourse with his friends; and as, since the death of his two old servants, a gardener and his wife, there are only a few of those still living, who were on terms of intimacy with him, who were acquainted with his habits of life, and who could relate their conversations with him on the subject of his visions and revelations, I was called upon by a worthy man to state what I had seen and heard in Swedenborg's company; especially, as I had the advantage of being frequently at his house, in the character of a friend, and of meeting him in company, at my own house, and at the houses of my relations. . . .

"Swedenborg worked without much regard to the distinction of day and night, having no fixed time for labor or rest. 'When I am sleepy,' he said, 'I go to bed.' All the attendance he required from his servant, his gardener's wife, consisted in her making his bed, and placing a large jug of water in his ante-room, his house-keeping being so arranged that he could make his own coffee in his study; and this coffee he drank in great abundance, both day and night, and with a great deal of sugar. When not invited out, his dinner consisted of nothing but a roll soaked in boiled milk; and this was his meal always when he dined at home. He never at that time used wine or strong drink, nor did he eat anything in the evening; but in company he would eat freely, and indulge moderately in a social glass. . . .

"It was difficult for him to talk quickly; for he then stuttered, especially when he was obliged to talk in a foreign tongue. Of foreign languages, in addition to the learned languages, he understood well French, English, Dutch, German, and Italian; for he had journeyed several times in these countries. He spoke slowly; and it was always a pleasure to be with him at table, for whenever Swedenborg spoke, all other talk was hushed; and the slowness with

which he spoke had the effect of restraining the frivolous remarks of the curious in the assembly. At first he used to talk freely about his visions, and his explanations of Scripture, but when this displeased the clergy, and they pronounced him a heretic or a downright madman, he resolved to be more sparing of his communications in company, or at all events to be more on his guard, so as not to offer an opportunity to scoffers of inveighing against what they could not understand as well as himself.

"I once addressed the pastor of our parish, an old and esteemed clergyman, and asked him what I ought to think of Swedenborg's visions and of his explanations of the Bible. This honourable man answered me with the spirit of true tolerance: 'Let God be the judge, how these things are in reality! But I cannot pass the same judgment upon him that many others do; I have spoken with him myself, and I have found in company where he was with me, that he is a pious and good man.'

"It was also remarkable, that Swedenborg, unlike sectarian persons, never tried to make proselytes, or to force his explanations upon any one. This I know from a conversation I had with him, as to whether it is possible for any other man to come into the same degree of spirituality in which he was. He said, 'Take good care; this is the direct road to insanity: for when a man pores over spiritual and hidden things, he cannot protect himself against the delusions of hell, which then come over him and trouble him, when from his natural man and by his own speculations he tries to fathom heavenly things, which transcend his comprehension.' He then explained to me, that the Lord in His prayer taught us to pray against such speculations, in the words *Lead us not into temptation;* by which is meant that we must not, from our own power and by our own intelligence, begin to doubt the heavenly truths which are revealed to us: 'For,' he added, 'you are well aware how often it has happened, that students, and especially theologians, who unnecessarily indulged too much in

speculations, have lost their understanding. I, for my own part,' he concluded, 'had never expected to come into that spiritual state, in which I am now; but the Lord selected me for this state, and for revealing the spiritual meaning of the Sacred Scriptures, which He had promised in the prophets and in the Book of Revelation. My purpose previously had been to explore nature, chemistry, and the sciences of mining and anatomy.'

"This conversation gave me an opportunity of asking him, where and how it was granted him to see and to hear what takes place in the world of spirits, in heaven, and in hell. Whereupon Swedenborg answered as follows*: 'I was in London and dined rather late at the inn where I was in the habit of dining, and where I had my own room. My thoughts were engaged on the subjects we have been dis-

*It should be borne in mind that the account here given as though a repetition of Swedenborg's own words was written many years after the actual conversation or conversations thus reported. The inaccuracies involved are evident to one sufficiently acquainted with the actual records of Swedenborg's life, especially his own diary jottings. For instance, Swedenborg's own account of the experience when he saw frogs and other creatures on the floor, is to be found in his "Adversaria," Vol. II, nos. 1956-7. He there says that it occurred in April, 1745; and he makes no mention of the appearance of a man, or of any words spoken. As a matter of fact the opening of his spiritual senses began more than a year before that date, the process being gradual; and his own account is found in his so-called "Journal of Dreams" (March to Oct. 1744). Under date of April 6-7, 1744, he there records the first appearance of the Lord (as he then believed) to him; and he mentions that the first words spoken to him concerned the condition of his health. At that time he was not told what he was being prepared for. The fact that the published volumes of his *Regnum Animale* bear dates of 1744 and 1745, is sufficient evidence that he did not immediately drop his work in scientific lines. Then came the intermediate treatise (never finished) entitled "The Worship and Love of God," also published in 1745. He saw nothing else through the press until 1749, when the first volume of his *Arcana Cœlestia* appeared.

The inaccuracies of Robsahm's account at this point suggest that all reports of conversations with Swedenborg should be viewed critically and accepted (if at all) with due caution.

cussing. I was hungry, and ate with a good appetite. Towards the close of the meal I noticed a sort of dimness before my eyes: this became denser, and I then saw the floor covered with the most horrid crawling reptiles, such as snakes, frogs, and similar creatures. I was amazed; for I was perfectly conscious, and my thoughts were clear. At last the darkness increased still more; but it disappeared all at once, and I then saw a man sitting in a corner of the room; as I was then alone, I was very much frightened at his words, for he said: *'Eat not so much.'* All became black again before my eyes, but immediately it cleared away, and I found myself alone in the room. Such an unexpected terror hastened my return home; I did not let the landlord notice anything; but I considered well what had happened, and could not look upon it as a mere matter of chance, or as if it had been produced by a physical cause. I went home; and during the night the same man revealed himself to me again, but I was not frightened now. He then said that He was the Lord God, the Creator of the world, and the Redeemer, and that He had chosen me to explain to men the spiritual sense of the Scripture, and that He Himself would explain to me what I should write on this subject; that same night also were opened to me, so that I became thoroughly convinced of their reality, the worlds of spirits, heaven, and hell, and I recognized there many acquaintances of every condition in life. From that day I gave up the study of all worldly science, and labored in spiritual things, according as the Lord had commanded me to write. Afterwards the Lord opened, daily very often, my bodily *(lekamlig)* eyes, so that, in the middle of the day I could see into the other world, and in a state of perfect wakefulness converse with angels and spirits.'

"Swedenborg rarely went to Church; partly, because he could not be edified by preaching which was so different from his own revelations; and partly because he suffered from the stone. Neither did he partake of the Holy Communion; and as he was closely related to two bishops, one

of them, during the diet of 1760, remonstrated with him upon it in a friendly manner. Swedenborg answered, that inasmuch as he was conjoined with the Lord God, and had been called by Him, and as he was, moreover, in company with angels and saints, this religious act, in his case, could not be looked upon in the same light, as in the case of the other inhabitants of this earth. But when he was reminded that by observing the sacrament he would set a good example, he yielded and he took the communion before the altar of the Church which had been fitted up for the Maria parish after the conflagration of 1759.

"A few days previously he asked his old serving people, which clergyman he might ask for this service, for he did not know them particularly. When the elder chaplain was proposed, Swedenborg said at once: 'No; for he is a passionate man, and a violent priest; I was much displeased in hearing him thunder from the pulpit.' His assistant was then proposed, the second chaplain, who was less liked in the parish. 'This one,' Swedenborg said, 'I desire; for I have heard that he speaks as he thinks, and that for this reason he has lost credit among the people, as is usually the case in the world.'

"Swedenborg once told me the reason why no others among the clergy, except Doctor Beyer in Gottenburg, had embraced his explanations of the Scripture. The reason of this is, that daily, from the time when they attend school in the gymnasium [academy], and in the university, they confirm themselves in the doctrine, and in favor of the doctrine, of faith alone; and whenever any one has confirmed himself in anything evil, he no longer looks upon the evil as evil, but becomes daily more delighted with it. 'Nay,' he added, 'though they should actually see and find out that I speak the truth, their love of places of honor and of consideration, and their self-interest, will not permit them to profess publicly what, in accordance with their own conviction, they find to be incontestable truths.' This conversation I had with Swedenborg, a short time after he had

a visit from the celebrated clergyman, Doctor Rutström, who died in prison, in the castle of Stockholm, some time after the revolution of 1772. Swedenborg said, 'This Rutström saw everything, but his life and deeds showed that his Moravian sect was dearest to him, in which he had long ago confirmed himself, even to persuasion'; and he added, that such was the case with the clergy of every religion, who, after they have confirmed themselves in the doctrines which they profess, can never more be induced to give up the most preposterous propositions.

"The chaplain of the Imperial Russian Legation, Oronoskow, who was in Stockholm during the time of the ambassador, Count Ostermann, was a monk of the Alexander-Newsky order, and led an orderly and pious life; quite differently from the other Russian priests who had been here before him. He became acquainted with me, and I lent him Swedenborg's books, which, he said, he read with the greatest delight. He desired to see Swedenborg, and to talk with this remarkable man. I complied with his desire, and invited Swedenborg and him to dinner, in company with the late president of the Royal College of Commerce, Mr. von Carleson, and the Councillor of Chancery, Mr. Berch, together with several of my relations. During dinner the chaplain asked Swedenborg among other things, whether he had seen the Empress Elizabeth. Swedenborg then asked some one to tell him (for he always spoke in Swedish, and the conversation was carried on in French, which was well understood and pretty well spoken by the chaplain), 'I have seen her often, and I know that she is in a very happy state.' This answer brought tears of joy into the chaplain's eyes, who said that she had been good and just. 'Yes,' said Swedenborg, 'her kind feeling for her people was made known, after her death, in the other life; for there it was shown, that she never went into the council without praying to God, and asking for his advice and assistance, in order that she might govern well her country and her people.' This gladdened the chaplain

so much, that he expressed his joyful surprise by silence and tears. . . .

"When he left Sweden for the last time, he came of his own accord to me at the bank on the day he was to leave, and gave me a protest against any condemnation of his writings during his absence; which protest was based upon the law of Sweden, and in which he stated, that *the House of Priests was not the only judge in matters of religion, inasmuch as theology belonged also to the other Houses.* On this occasion I asked him the same question as before, viz., whether I should ever see him again. His answer was quite tender and touching: 'Whether I shall come again, that,' said he, 'I do not yet know; but of this I can assure you, for the Lord has promised to me, that I shall not die, until I shall have received from the press this work, (the *Vera Christiana Religio*), which is now ready to be printed and for the sake of which I now undertake this journey; but if we do not meet again in the body we shall meet in the presence of the Lord, provided we live in this world according to His will and not according to our own.' He then took leave of me in as blithe and cheerful a frame of mind, as if he had been a man in his best years; and the same day he departed for the last time from Sweden.

"I asked Swedenborg once whether his explanations would be received in Christendom. 'About that,' said he, 'I can say nothing; but I suppose that in their proper time they will be received; for otherwise the Lord would not have disclosed what has heretofore lain concealed.'

"He was never ill except when temptations came over him; but he was frequently troubled with tooth-ache. I came to him once on such an occasion, when he complained of a severe tooth-ache, which had continued for several days. I recommended to him a common remedy for soothing the pain; but he answered at once, that his tooth-ache was not caused by a diseased nerve, but by the influx of hell from hypocrites, who tempted him, and who by correspondence caused this pain, which he said, he knew, would soon stop and leave him. . . .

"When Swedenborg went abroad, he never studied his comfort, but always traveled in an open carriage, without a servant, to Gottenburg; and thence he went by sea either to England or Holland, in order to get his manuscripts printed. . . .

"I asked Swedenborg about these voyages of his, and he said, that he himself wondered at the remarkably good fortune which he always had when he traveled by sea; but he observed at the same time, that any intelligent man could see, that he was not able to do miracles.

"During the session of the Diet he was interested in hearing news from the House of Nobles, of which he was a member by virtue of his being the head of the Swedenborg family. He wrote several memorials; but when he saw that party-spirit and self-interest struggled for mastery, he went rarely up to the House of Nobles. In his conversations with his friends, he inveighed against the spirit of dissension among the members of the Diet; and in acting with a party he was never a party-man, but loved truth and honesty in all he did. . . .

"Many, during Swedenborg's life-time, wondered where he obtained money enough to make such long journeys, and to incur such heavy expenses. But when we take into consideration his economical mode of living, and the little money he needed while traveling, a moderate capital only was required for this purpose; especially, also, as his philosophical and mineralogical works had a large sale. Nor did his spiritual writings remain on the booksellers' shelves, but always yielded him some resources. . . .

"As Swedenborg, in his younger days, did not think of the work which was to occupy him in his more advanced years, it can easily be imagined that in his time he was not only a learned man, but also a polished gentleman; for a man of such extensive learning, who, by his books, his travels, and his knowledge of languages, had acquired distinction both at home and abroad, could not fail to possess the manners and everything else which, in those so-called

serious or sober times, caused a man to be honored, and made him agreeable in society. He was accordingly, even in his old age, cheerful, sprightly, and agreeable in company; yet, at the same time, his countenance presented those uncommon features, which are only seen in men of great genius.

"I know not how he was regarded abroad: but I hope it may not be uninteresting to know how he was regarded in Stockholm, especially by those who could not read his writings, and who met him only by chance in society, or heard others speak of him.

"Those who were able to read his books judged of him then, as they do now, quite differently from those who were unable to read them; and what is remarkable, most of those who do read his books become in a greater or less degree his adherents; although 'for fear of the Jews,' and on account of many and perhaps just causes, they do not openly profess their sentiments. Their judgment generally is, that, with the exception of his memorable relations, and the conversations and visions which he quotes, there is much that is good in his writings; because he insists upon leading a life in conformity with the will of God and His commandments; which manifests itself by the shunning of sin, and a new life from the heart, and also by love to the Lord and the neighbor. . . .

"Swedenborg had ordered for the Diet in Norrköping (1769) a small box of his works from England, which in accordance with the regulations of customs was detained in the customhouse, on account of their containing foreign or heterodox thoughts on religion. Swedenborg, therefore, asked a clergyman [Bishop Filenius], one of his influential relatives, to get this box released for him, because he desired to distribute the books among the members of the various Houses of the Diet. This man assured Swedenborg he would, and on leaving embraced and kissed him; but when he went up to the House, it was he who insisted most strongly that the books should not be released. For this

man Swedenborg entertained afterwards great contempt, and always called him Judas Iscariot, who betrayed his friend with a kiss. Swedenborg said that he would have been much better pleased with a downright refusal, than with a false promise inspiring confidence. He could not do otherwise than reprove such conduct; for in his whole life and in all his writings, in agreement with the tenor of God's Word he insisted upon truth and honesty among men, and indeed for the reason, that God has so commanded for the sake of men's own happiness among themselves. He said also, 'He who speaks lies, acts them in his life, and this is an abomination in the sight of God.'

"During the Diet of 1769 a cunning stratagem was planned by some members of the House of the Clergy, by which Swedenborg was to be summoned before a court of justice, and after the first examination to be declared a man who had lost his senses by his speculations in religion, whom it was most dangerous to leave in freedom, and who therefore ought to be confined in a lunatic asylum. As soon as a certain senator, a friend of Swedenborg's, heard about this, he wrote him a letter, in which he disclosed the scheme, and advised him to leave the country. Swedenborg upon this became very sorrowful, and going straightway into his garden, fell upon his knees, and in tears prayed to the Lord, and asked Him what he should do; when he received the comforting assurance, that nothing evil should befall him—as was the case; for his enemies did not dare to carry out their persecution, when they considered that he was the head of a family, and related to other influential families, both in the House of Nobles and in the House of the Clergy.

"This information I received from Mr. Seele, an agent here in Stockholm; to whose house Swedenborg very frequently went, and to whom he had told this.

"I can assure the reader in all truth that these miscellaneous statements, which I remember of my intercourse with this venerable man, are true in every particular, and that I should not have written them down, if I had not been

requested to do so by the honorable man who is mentioned at the beginning of these anecdotes, and if he had not intimated that they would be made use of in enlightening posterity about Swedenborg's personal character, and indeed by a society, whose purpose it is to translate several of his writings into French.

"I know from experience that there is not a single word in all his writings which leads man away from the doing of God's will, and consequently from a sincere love of the neighbor; there is contained, however, therein an entirely new system, which is opposed to the principal religions professed by men, and to all their sects, but which agrees with all of them in this particular, that blessedness and misery depend upon man's life in time.

"All this Swedenborg has proved abundantly in his writings, and especially has he written against the dangerous doctrine of faith alone; and if we in the History of the Church follow those who have been instrumental in establishing religions, we find that all religions, from the earliest to the latest times, have been instituted by well-meaning prelates, and that afterwards they have been subverted partly by ignorant, and partly by cunning and crafty prelates. In conclusion, however, I earnestly desire that every one who reads Swedenborg's writings should do so with caution, and that he should rather remain in the faith he received in childhood, and which was often impressed upon him with severity, and which very few among the professors of faith examine, than that he should from frivolity or from blind zeal revile what he cannot understand. For such persons read all the prophets and the book of revelation, where they understand nothing, with the same feeling of contempt with which they read Swedenborg's system, where, however, everything may be easily understood by him who does not amuse himself at the expense of truth, and who does not reject everything that does not agree with his own pre-conceived notions.

CARL ROBSAHM,
Treasurer of the Bank, Stockholm.

Stockholm, March 29, 1782."

It should be borne in mind that Robsahm's account is more or less affected by the atmosphere of the time when he wrote. The strong current of ecclesiastic opposition had been rising steadily for more than ten years; and the popular resentment at Swedenborg's extraordinary claims, re-enforced by the derision of the "conservative" classes, was more and more pronounced and intolerant. The displeasure of the clergy was manifested by applying the epithets "heretic" and "madman." Judgment upon his "visions" and his "explanations of the Bible" was called for as the order of the day. The difference in the attitude of those who were able to read his books and those who were not, was characteristic as well as prophetic. It has held true down to the present time that "most of those who do read his books become in greater or less degree his adherents."

The account as a whole shows a distinct concentration of attention upon the critical phases and aspects of Swedenborg's character and life: the question of his diet and health, his appearance and conduct in social life, his supernatural claims, and the character and reception of his doctrines. On all these points testimony is direct and valuable.

Lewis F. Hite.

CHURCH AND STATE

By William Warren Towle

EVER since the adoption of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire, more than three centuries after the Author and Finisher of that faith had fulfilled His mission upon earth and given the precept to His disciples to "go forth and preach the Gospel to every living creature," the conflict between Church and State has been waged all over the civilized world.

Religious differences have played a part in more than one-half of the wars of Europe. Many conscientious efforts to establish the Lord's Kingdom upon the earth have met with governmental opposition, resulting in armed resistance and bloodshed. It would be an endless task to attempt to recount the battles that have been fought in the name of religion in the past, and impossible to foretell those which may take place in the future.

The situation now existing in Mexico may well be referred to as one of the great crises arising because of Church interference and domination in the conduct of government. During the sixteenth century Catholic missionaries came to Mexico. They found there an uneducated people composed mostly of idolatrous Indians. They converted these pagans into the Catholic faith, and practically all the *teocalli* or idol shrines were closed. Today ninety-five per cent of the Mexican population is allied with the Catholic Church. Magnificent cathedrals and church buildings have been erected at an expense of millions upon millions of dollars. Luxurious and costly altars, statues, and furnishings, adorn the interiors of the churches. For a time the Church supported common schools; but afterwards, in the place of these, parochial schools were established. The Church acquired such an accumulation of wealth that nearly two-thirds of all the property of the country had passed into

its control. Any action of the congress for the protection of persons and property was of little or no effect; and public affairs came to such a pass that in 1917 a new constitution was adopted.

Under this new constitution the General Government has now taken over the buildings and all the property of the Church, and is putting in force laws under the new regime, by which the Church is forbidden: to own real estate, or mortgages on same; to own church buildings, or any other buildings; to possess invested funds, or other productive property; to maintain convents or nunneries; to conduct primary schools; to direct or administer charitable institutions; to solicit funds for its support outside of church buildings; to hold religious ceremonies outside of church buildings; or to clothe its ministers with a garb indicative of their calling.

Moreover, ministers of religion may not publicly criticize the fundamental laws, the authorities in particular, or the government in general. They may not vote, hold office, or assemble for political purposes. Clergymen may not inherit real property occupied by a religious association, or inherit from fellow-clergymen or from private individuals not blood relatives. No assembly of a political character may be held in a place of public worship. No political party may bear a name indicative of relation to any religious belief. No religious periodical may comment on political affairs. No studies carried on in theological seminaries may be credited in a state university. Official permission must be obtained before opening a new temple of worship for public use. The state legislature may determine the maximum number of ministers of religious creeds according to the needs of a locality. Marriage appertains to the exclusive jurisdiction of the civil authorities, although, of course, a religious ceremony may follow it.

In the Laws of Reform of 1859, the Constitution of 1857, and the laws enacted under it one finds: the suppression of monasteries and the nationalization of their property; prohibition of novices' taking the veil; abolition of religious

holidays, save those specified by law; the ringing of church-bells subjected to local ordinances; and municipalization of cemeteries.

From this bristling array one may safely deduce that Mexico has been the theatre of a prolonged and desperate struggle between Church and State.

There are a number of American Protestant missions in Mexico; but, as Mr. Edward Alsworth Ross, an authority on the Mexican situation, in his articles on the Social Revolution in Mexico, says:

> There is abundant room for doubting if Protestantism has a large future in Mexico. For a long time the masses will be ignorant, simple-minded people, to whom the symbols and dramatic features of Catholic worship will appeal.

The nations of the world are as a rule jealously guarding their governmental affairs from interference by foreign intervention. It is rumored that today China, Japan, Turkey, and India, are all more or less inimical toward certain American missionaries and Christian workers, in the fear that some propaganda may be started which will clash with their existing forms of governing. This has been true for centuries.

When Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, an eminent American missionary, who was instrumental in founding Robert College at Constantinople, began that work, he was obliged openly to defy the Sultan of Turkey, and would undoubtedly have had to abandon the undertaking, had he not been backed by the armed forces of England. As a result of his indomitable perseverance, Robert College was established, which for years has fitted teachers for the schools in the Balkan States, and, working with other institutions, extended the influence of American education throughout the far East.

Our own country has so far been particularly free from complications between Church and State. As the late Dr. Charles W. Eliot, for years President of Harvard College, once said in a carefully prepared address:

> The successful establishment and support of religious institutions—churches, seminaries, and religious charities—upon a purely

voluntary system, is an unprecedented achievement of American democracy. In only three generations, American democratic society has effected the complete separation of Church and State, a reform which no other people have ever attempted.

America has always been a Christian land. The forefathers came to these shores with the avowed purpose of seeking a place where they would have "freedom to worship God." In the early days there was no opportunity for conflict between Church and State, as all matters pertaining to the government and the welfare of the community were of common interest. Scriptural admonition was the guide of action; and literal Biblical law was applied as a matter of course. All bills of right, charters, constitutions, and many public documents, in their beginning contained an appeal for the blessings of God Almighty, and that through His Grace the covenants might be entered into.

When the country had gained its independence, and the Constitution had been adopted, it was soon amended by the insertion of a provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an established religion, or prohibit the free exercise thereof." Vouchsafing this right of protection in the exercise of religion to the citizens, does not, however, make the nation any less one committed to a belief in God as the Supreme Ruler; nor does it impede the permeation of Christianity through all American institutions. It has often been judicially decided that Christianity is a part of the common law of the land.

Quoting from the highest court of the country its language and rulings, we read:

Every constitution of the States contains certain language which either directly or by clear implication recognizes a profound reverence for religion, and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well being of the Community; as the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of Civil Government, essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality. These cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of public worship of God and public instruction in piety, religion, and morality.

Swedenborg says, "There must be governors, skilled in

law, wise, and men who fear God" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10792).

In the United States rumblings are being heard in protest against the activities of the Church in bringing influence to bear upon the enactment of legislation, and the enforcement of existing laws, regulating prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor; upon the control by national law of child labor; upon the establishment of a uniform system of education throughout the country: upon international alliance with the League of Nations and the World Court; upon means and methods providing for the amelioration of the so-called laboring classes, and for the betterment of relations between employer and employed in the industrial field. In all of these matters the Churches individually and collectively are justified in using their influence, by endorsement and petition, in seeking such laws and regulations as they deem are for the uplift and improvement of humanity.

The beneficial influence of the Christian Church is without doubt recognized throughout the entire land, in that its property and that of charitable institutions is generally exempt from taxation. This exemption is on the ground that the communities are benefited morally by the existence of churches in their midst, and that thereby the value of property is enhanced; that they render police protection less expensive; and that much other public advantage goes along with their existence.

The present period is not, however, a church-going age. Public recognition of the beneficial influences of organized religious institutions does not appear to result in a corresponding material acknowledgment by way of support of these organizations.

There has never been a civilized nation without a religion. No one can conjecture what this country would be, had not religion been a powerful factor, and the Bible and Christian theology formed the background of the American idea of government and human dealings. Should the Christian foundations upon which American institutions

have rested pass into decay, the imagination cannot conceive what would happen to its superstructure of law, commerce, and social institutions. And yet no one is denied the full exercise of his ideas of religion, provided, however, they are not shockingly antagonistic to morality, or to the established views of the existence of a higher Divine power and Christianity. The American Government was founded on a belief in God as the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and an established belief in Christianity; and its citizens have the right to rely in good faith upon the perpetual upholding of these principles in the conduct of the affairs of State.

This year, in its annual Labor Day expression of its good offices,

> The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America greets labor, capital, and the public with twelve Christian social ideals, translated into the practical terms of industry and economic relationships. She does so in the spirit of Jesus's two commandments, "Love thy God, and love thy neighbor," and of St. John's pragmatic test of conversion, "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."

And after expressing these ideals the message adds:

> Micah, though dead, yet speaketh on Labor Day, "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."
>
> On Labor Sunday, under the mantle of religion, let capital and labor come together in a friendly spirit "to worship the Lord and to inquire in his temple."

It is not the policy of the councils of the Federation of Churches to endorse any movement into which there enters any question involving differences in theology or creed; or to stress action in matters the subject of which from a moral point of view is fairly debatable. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America does, however, put out each year certain ideals which it believes will be useful in the industrial world. These are suggestions for action which in no way are objectionable to those having at heart the welfare of the employed, the lightening of burdensome conditions, and the uplift of humanity.

Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, the President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, speaking of the future of American churches says:

That day has passed when any part of our great industrial, social, political, or international life can be considered as outside the Church's sphere of responsibility. Throughout the country influential voices are declaring from the pulpit and in ecclesiastical assemblies, that the organized group life of society is to be subject to the rule of Christ no less than the life of the individual. However, when the churches attempt to mold public opinion on vital issues, they soon discover that, if they are to do so effectively, they must act far more unitedly than has hitherto been the case. The realization of this fact has led to the second notable trend in American religious life, namely, the progress of co-operation among the Churches. Few things are more noteworthy in the history of American Christianity during the last two decades; and the rising tide of interest on the part of the American Churches in behalf of world peace is, perhaps, the most notable evidence of the way in which our Protestant forces are moving unitedly forward to face new responsibilities. It is the judgment of close observers of the political situation, that no single factor has counted for more in the final decision of the United States Government to enter the World Court than the persistent and united activity of the Churches in behalf of this step. There is a leavening consciousness abroad, that Protestantism has in the past too easily surrendered to the State concerning major questions which, while superficially political, are really moral questions. The divided state of Protestantism has been especially responsible for its having so nearly abdicated this strategic field. The knitting-up of its isolated forces into something like a unified whole will mean much in regaining a moral autonomy for the Churches in all ranges of human activity.

There will be no State Church so long as the Churches preach the doctrine of liberty in accordance with organized law; or, as we of the New Church would say, of "freedom and rationality."

A people's church was organized in East Lansing, Mich., representing national and state bodies of four churches—Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian—and the people of the church itself. The creed of this people's church is simple, but adequate:

I believe in the teaching of Jesus Christ, and with the help of God I will strive daily to live the life of unselfishness, purity, and service which He exemplified.

The leaders of the great labor organizations from time to time are invited to meet the representatives of the Federal Council in the discussion of various problems, and even to occupy the pulpits on Labor Sundays and other occasions of special import.

The long drawn-out discussions of evolution, modernism, fundamentalism, psychology, and kindred subjects, and even certain courses in Bible study, seem to have a tendency to create a feeling of distrust in the old time religious teachings, without giving any satisfactory conception of spiritual belief in their place. The religious world is in a state of transition, from which we may have faith to believe the truth will eventually be evolved.

Religion cannot be legislated into men; still, it is the duty of the Church to try and bring about morally healthful conditions under which they may live. And in doing this it need not come into conflict with the State; but through its good offices, it may be a tower of friendly strength to the State in maintaining its adherence to those principles upon which the American nation was established, so firmly that the government will never drift from its moorings of inherited Christianity.

In conclusion, let me quote the following statement of the bearing of our doctrines upon the relation between Church and State:

The Two Great Commandments on Love to the Lord and Love to the Neighbor have a direct bearing on the question of the relation of Church and State. For if we receive and act out the Lord's Love, it is His Love for men that we receive; and this is love to the neighbor, which in the true and full sense is love for men individually and collectively, in their personal, social, political, moral, and spiritual life.

This is just what Swedenborg develops in his "Doctrine of Charity." He distinguishes and enumerates the various degrees of Love to the Neighbor. In the first and lowest degree, a man's

body is his neighbor in that he should care for his body to keep it in the best condition for its work, and this care is a form of love, which is truly unselfish and has far reaching consequences, consequences for health and consequences for usefulness to others.

In a higher degree a man's family is his neighbor; for he should love and provide for the family welfare in all its branches. This involves not only his own personal usefulness, but the usefulness of the several members of his family; and so his love extends to a wider circle.

In a still higher degree the community in which a man lives is his neighbor; and this means that he should love to promote the welfare of the community in all respects, social, industrial, political, moral, and spiritual. It is important to observe that these three degrees are intimately associated, and that each grows out of the preceding. The care of a man's body secures his health, and his best service to his family; so the family welfare leads to its usefulness to the community. From another point of view, we see that the Lord's love for the community as a whole is expressed in the welfare of the family, and through the family in the welfare of the individuals; and each individual receives these larger loves or higher degrees of love. This is what makes the love of the neighbor a law of God.

In a fourth degree a man's country, or his state, is his neighbor. This is in a way an extension of the love for the community; for the state is a community of communities. So that in loving his country, or his state, a man loves not only to promote the social, industrial, political, moral, and spiritual welfare of the citizens, but he loves to promote the institutions of his country, and the political and civil laws of his state; otherwise he would be lacking in love.

Other and higher degrees of love to the neighbor involve humanity as a whole, the Church, and highest of all the Lord. The Lord is the neighbor in the supreme degree in the sense that our love for Him includes loves for the Church and for humanity.

This defines the relation of the Church to the State, inasmuch as the Church is the recipient of the Lord's love for men universally. It follows that the Church should love to promote the welfare of all men and all groups of men, including states, societies, institutions, etc. The Church, therefore, should seek to improve the laws and institutions of the State, and should take an active part in enlightening the citizens from its spiritual point of view, and in the light and strength of its larger love, as to good and bad laws, and as to good and bad candidates for office. But, of course, the citizens of the State should elect the officers; and the authorities of the State should pass the laws, and administer them. But even in the pas-

sage of the laws and in their administration the Church actually does and should shed its light and exert its influence, both individually and collectively. The Church should form and express its organized opinion and judgment in the light of its higher and larger love; and it should exert its organized influence upon all branches of civic life, irrespective of political parties and social groups. Otherwise it would be lacking in the exercise of its love. The State, on the other hand, should look to the Church for enlightenment, and should consult the Church in carrying out measures for the public good. It is true, that the members of the Church are also citizens of the State, and as such they act in either case on their own individual responsibility; but they also act with the organized opinion in each case, and share in the organized action. This may in some cases raise the question of rightful and supreme allegiance; but in general the Church does not legislate and administer directly in the body of civic life in its organized capacity, and the State is free to accept or reject the judgments and conclusions of the Church. This secures the independence of the respective organizations, and the independence of the members composing them. Citizens as Church members have the civic responsibility of electing the officers, of legislating, and of administering the laws. The Church may counsel and advise, but it cannot act, in these matters. In this way the Church and State co-operate in promoting the welfare of the people of the country. If we had a universal Church and a universal political organization after the model of the League of Nations, then the Church and State would be mutually co-operative in the largest measure.

All this grows out of the nature of love,—love to the Lord and to man. It is this love that unites Church and State. What separates Church and State is the distinct forms of organization. The State functions in more or less independence of the organized Church; and so the Church as an organization functions in more or less independence of the State. But still they are interrelated variously and vitally. The marriage ceremony, for example, is performed independently by the Church; but the marriage is authorized and legalized by the State. The Church observes the laws of the State in its administration, especially in its administration of funds and property.

Through the operation of the Lord's universal love for men, Church and State are bound together by ties of mutual service. They are distinct human institutions, but they are one in Divine and human purpose.

W. W. Towle.

MIND AS BEHAVIOR.*

By the Rev. Lewis Field Hite.

WHETHER Behaviorism is the last resort of naturalism and materialism or not, it seems to ordinary understanding that to take "mind as behavior" is to blot mind and spirit out of existence altogether, and leave us with a bare physical organism and a bare material universe.

It is true that the issue is dulled by matching the complexities of mind with the complexities of behavior; and then it seems a matter of indifference whether we say mind is behavior, or behavior is mind. Nevertheless, for practical purposes at least, mental states such as feelings, sentiments, ideas, thoughts, and judgments, are commonly known to be unmistakably different from material bodies, such as rocks, trees, tables, houses, airplanes, horses, etc. In spite of the difficulty Kant had to distinguish between the imaginary and the real gold dollar, we have no trouble in making the distinction between the automobile pictured in imagination and the automobile which carries us to town at the rate of thirty miles an hour. In short, we know what we mean by mental states as distinguished from the bodies of the world around us. In our practical, and in our artistic and moral life as well, this distinction is taken for granted, and we proceed without error or confusion.

A bare physiological organism, or a bare material universe, has never been acceptable to any class of philosophers, whether materialistic or idealistic; for one reason among many, that such a view cannot be stated consistently, nor indeed intelligibly. Thomas Hobbes made perhaps the most

**Mind as Behavior;* and Studies in Empirical Idealism. By Edgar Arthur Singer. Columbus, Ohio: R. G. Adams & Co. 1924. 310 pp., 8vo. $2.50.

deliberate and systematic attempt to construct a purely materialistic philosophy; and yet in the very first paragraph of "The Leviathan" he breaks down before the alternative of unintelligibility or inconsistency. In other words, he starts out to describe all human action in terms merely of the motion of particles; but to be significant he has to introduce immediately such terms as "appear," "seem," and "fancy," which imply an observer, and an interpreter. A like fate has met all such attempts.

But the issue, apparently so clear cut, is by no means so easily settled. Neither science nor philosophy has ever presented concretely a bare physical organism, or a bare material universe. The nearest approach to this was the old Greek atomic theory; but even Democritus made a distinction between the atoms, such that the finer atoms were supposed to have conscious properties, or relations. The difficulty is not so much the existence as the meaning of a "bare physical organism," or a "bare material universe." The very word "bare" implies a contrast with a physical organism, or a material universe, which is not "bare"; and this gives the philosophy its problem.

Swedenborg teaches that the physical universe, nature, is an image of the spiritual; that nature exists as an effect of the spiritual world as cause; and that the physical world and the spiritual have the relation of correspondence to each other. This is the same as saying that there is no such thing as a bare material universe; that the objects of the physical world are created such, and have no independent existence. This is the traditional Christian view, however faithless Christians may have been to it.

But this does not seem to solve the problem of our actual experience. Granted, if you please, that all reality is experience, as philosophy now maintains, we still have such things as granite rocks, logs of wood, the green fields, the blue sky, the red apples on the tree, etc. These are all real things, or supposed to be; but in what sense can it be said that they are experience. Whose experience, or what experience, is the granite rock, the blue sky, or the red apple?

These questions seem to suggest *reductio ad absurdum*; and it is questions like these that make the "plain man" laugh at the philosopher. Not to raise an age-long philosophical discussion, but only to give point to the fact of complexity, let us recall that Swedenborg said that the color of the apple is not in the apple, but that the red is a state of the perceiving organ. This to the uninitiated is a rather astounding assertion. It does, however, transfer a part of one of these outer objects, material objects, viz., the color of the apple, to the mind. So also in case of taste, smell, etc. And the problem arises, Where is the process of transfer to stop? We are all familiar with Berkeley's epoch-making analysis of our experience of the apple, the outcome of which was to transform the entire apple into the experience of the perceiver. At this point the issue between the realist and the idealist arises: the realist maintaining that the apple is really what it appears to be, and that it is mysteriously independent of knowledge; the idealist holding that the apple is an appearance, and that it is what it is by the fact that it is experienced. The arguments serve to emphasize the exceeding complexity of experience, and to bring in question the distinction between body and mind. Common sense is inclined to take sides with the realist on the ground that bodies are obviously colored, heavy, etc., and that a color must be the color of some body. This argument, however, receives a shock in the case of the blue sky, where there is certainly no object, or body, which is blue. If we attempt to explain why it is that the sky appears to be blue, and fall back on the ether-wave theory, it is even more evident that, as Swedenborg says, the blue is the state of the perceiving organ, that is a state of the mind.

Now the lesson of all this is, that there is no such thing in the real world as a bare physical body, a body unrelated to and independent of spirit; and that the attempt to treat the mind as the behavior of such a body is obviously futile. The behavioristic argument has its plausibility and its value in just the fact that body and mind are interrelated characters of experience, and that the mind expresses itself in

the body. This fact gives dignity and importance to the contention that the mind is behavior.

Common sense vacillates between the view that mind is behavior, and the view that mind is other than behavior; as we say on the one hand that the man is his conduct (or, as the re-actionists say, religion is life), and on the other hand that the man expresses his mind—his will, thought, and purpose—in his conduct (or, as we otherwise say, the man expresses his religion in his life). Insistence on either of these alternative views emphasizes the issue involved in behaviorism, and at the same time exemplifies the ambiguities and the complexities of the issue. In other words, the man who asserts and the man who denies that mind is behavior may not be asserting and denying the same thing. Either may or may not be aware of the philosophy involved. The author of the book before us is keenly aware of the philosophy involved.

Professor Singer merits the distinction of being at once subtle, penetrating, and elusive. He writes with a background of history and dialectics which few even among professionals have at ready command; in this book at least he is acutely controversial, and for the most part he is dealing with the last stages of controversy. The book is interesting and important for discussion of the precise issues, psychological and logical, involved in his thesis. The two parts, "Mind as Behavior" and "Empirical Idealism," may seem at first sight antithetic; but the connecting link is the meaning of sensation for both Behaviorism and Idealism. The author attempts to clear his ground by attacking the traditional doctrine, the doctrine of Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and so on, that knowledge begins with sensation; and he undertakes to show that sensation as immediate datum of consciousness is a pure abstraction, or rather the ideal limit of a process of abstraction. Accordingly both philosophy and science must abandon the unit-sensation as a starting point. This is the substantial issue of the book.

Part I is developed under the heads: Mind as Observable

Object; Consciousness as Behavior; The Pulse of Life; On Sensibility; On Pain and Dreams; On Man and Fellow-Man. Part II, Empirical Idealism, is developed under the heads: Sensation and the Datum of Science; Choice and Nature; On Mechanical Explanation; On Final Causes; Kant's First Antinomy—The Question of Fact; The Mathematician and His Luck. The two main contentions of the book—that mind is an observable object not in but as behavior, and that the unit-sensation cannot be considered the starting point of knowledge—are argued, if not convincingly, at least impressively.

As to the first he makes the point, to begin with, that the so-called "analogy argument" is a curious bit of fallacious reasoning. It assumes that I alone am aware that "certain of my bodily acts are accompanied by mental states." And "when I observe similar acts in other bodies, I infer that they too are accompanied by like states of mind." The analogy argument is attacked at three points. In the first place it is far from obvious that a man's mental state is known to him alone. This seems painfully true in some cases, as when we would give the world to know what our neighbor is thinking about. On the other hand we often think we know our neighbor's state of mind better than he knows it himself. "No one finds fault with Thackeray for intimating that the old Major is a better judge of Pendennis's feeling for Fotheringay than is Pendennis himself." In short, as social beings we each know ourselves through others, and this fact makes us unable to say that always and in the nature of the case our mental states are known only to ourselves and are securely hidden from observation by others. It cannot, therefore, be said that we can only *infer* that others have mental states from their behavior, which is like ours.

But the argument is liable to attack at another point. It claims to rest upon *inference;* but a well grounded inference implies a number of previously tested cases, and so there can be no inference from a single case. The fact that certain mental states accompany given behavior in my own

experience appears to be an isolated fact, even though repeated; the idea that like mental states accompany similar behavior in the case of my neighbor is not an inference, but perhaps a natural and proper suggestion. More likely, however, it is in its origin merely the acceptance of my neighbor's report or communication. For example, he tells me that the apple is sour, and I accept his report as meaning that he has the same sensation of taste that I have when I eat the apple. It may be said, of course, that this report is itself a case of behavior; but it should be noted and emphasized that the connection between words and mental states, however established in the first place, is peculiarly direct and uniform. So that it is the special function of words to express and communicate mental states.

Whatever the character or fate of the analogy argument, we may observe the fact that our mental states are our own unless and until we choose to communicate them by words, gestures, or some other type of behavior. At the same time, we cannot ignore the evidence that minds may communicate directly quite apart from the medium of bodily behavior.

But to return to the analogy argument, and consider another point. Whatever may be said of its reasoning, it seems to furnish the basis of the conclusion that there are other minds, and minds other than the behavior which expresses them. Is this conclusion right? How can we know that it is right? "Alas, I cannot know. If right, my experience cannot inform me; if wrong my experience cannot disillusion me. It makes no practical difference to me whether I am right or wrong." This is the pragmatic test of truth and meaning. William James, following Charles S. Peirce, said:

> The serious meaning of a concept lies in the concrete difference to some one which its being true will make. . . . If it can make no practical difference whether a given statement be true or false, then the statement has no real meaning. (Meaning of Truth, p. 52.)

Note that this is a test for concepts, not for concrete experience. As applied to the concepts "God" and "Matter" this test shows that they are to be regarded as synonymous

terms, "so long as no differing future consequences are deducible." But as matters of experience it is otherwise. James himself suggests this. He thought of an "automatic sweetheart," indistinguishable from a spiritually animated maiden, "laughing, talking, blushing, nursing us, and performing all feminine offices as tactfully and as sweetly as if a soul were in her." Then he asks, "Would any one regard her as a full equivalent?" He adds, "Certainly not; and why?" And answers, "Because, framed as we are, our egoism craves above all things inward sympathy and recognition, love and admiration." James's conclusion here is worth quoting:

> Pragmatically, then, belief in an automatic sweetheart would not *work*, and in point of fact no one treats it as a serious hypothesis. The godless universe would be exactly similar. Even if matter could do every outward thing that God does, the idea of it would not work as satisfactorily, because the chief call for God on modern men's part is for a being who will inwardly recognize them and judge them sympathetically. Matter disappoints this craving of our ego; so God remains for most men the truer hypothesis, and indeed remains so for definite pragmatic reasons.

This is the language of the acknowledged chief of the Pragmatists, and it adds to the difficulty of any Pragmatist becoming an atheist, or indeed a materialist. Our author, however, is not to be diverted from his aim and object. He is bent upon showing that there is no such thing as soul outside, within, or other than, behavior. He persists in asking what practical issue is involved in the disjunction—soul or no soul?

> Suppose [he says] I come to believe that my mistress, with all her loveliness, is really without a soul, I cannot think what I should mean by this, if it be not that I fear that her future conduct will not bear out my expectations regarding her.

What she is for me, and what she is in and for herself, is just the difference between a poorer and a richer experience of her, of her behavior.

All this discussion is meant to show that the analogy argument gives us no good reason for thinking that the

body, or the man, has a soul in the usual sense of the word, and that all that we can mean by soul is just the behavior of the man. The man is behavior.

The author maintains that the common idea of the soul is more or less mythical; and his discussion up to this point may be interpreted as an effort to destroy this myth. But although he would doubtless include this as one result of his effort, he would go further and claim that he has put forever out of the province of clear thinking the idea of the soul as a separate entity, distinct from the body, and as constituting of itself a body of consciousness. His next step, then, is to demolish the supposed separate, independent, and self-subsisting fact of consciousness. His procedure is interesting, plausible, and instructive. He begins by affirming that "Consciousness is not something inferred from behavior; it *is* behavior." To state the case more fully and accurately, he adds:

> Our belief in consciousness is an expectation of probable behavior based on an observation of actual behavior, a belief to be confirmed or refuted by more observation, as any other belief in a fact is to be tried out.

This reaches the bottom of the issue. Now we must ask, If consciousness is behavior, what aspect of behavior is it that leads us to call certain types of behavior conscious? In other words, we may insist on the Socratic question, What is consciousness? And further we may ask the same question about that aspect of behavior which we indicate by the word "living." Evidently the author sees no answer to these questions either in terms of concepts or in terms of concrete experience; and he surprises us by saying "I don't know what life means nor what consciousness means." In this he seems to be merely repeating what the biologists and the psychologists say to be rid of an embarrassing demand, for he adds:

> I feel that I know how we may go to work to find out these things, if once we see that neither stands for an eject forever veiled and hidden in the land beyond experience. Instead, then, of

venturing a word where a long and patient analysis would alone suffice, I may confine myself to the weighing of certain objections that would attack the very method here suggested for finding out what consciousness means. What is this method, and what are the objections?

It seems to common sense that any attempt to do away with the soul and with consciousness is too absurd for a moment's consideration. But such an attempt may help us to sharpen and define ideas of both. The author at this point enters upon the main contention of the book, and in doing so gives us the grounds and the methods which he relies upon to support his thesis that "mind is behavior." He is first of all interested to deny what the analogy argument assumes and concludes: that the mind of another is something which is hidden from our view. In opposition to this he asserts and maintains that the mind is an observable object; namely, behavior. But if, as we suppose, we are conscious of our mental states, and can recognize and name them, and follow them in their working to build up our body of knowledge, then we seem to have immediate data for observing and understanding both the existence and the working of our body of consciousness.

The author is constrained, therefore, to deny that there are any such data. He regards his own mind as behavior, precisely as he regards that of his fellow. He refers to the sensualistic school of Locke and Hume, and their attempt to build up the world of objects out of simple ideas. He attacks this type of philosophizing, and labors to show that experience exhibits nothing of the kind, such as an immediate datum, "known by itself." The alternative, however, leads the author along two lines of infinite regress, both of them vicious so far as the attainment of the object of our search is concerned. The beginning of our knowledge, so the argument runs, is no such datum; but knowledge begins just at any point where we stop and ask, What it is that I know, and how do I know it? From this point we enter upon two lines of enquiry: What is the real object of knowledge; and What is the original datum with which we

begin? Both lines are endless. This is putting the case very summarily and very abstractly; but it is sufficient to commit the author to skepticism and agnosticism, in which he has plenty of company.

This course of reflection is one way to dispose of the "bare datum" and sensualistic philosophy. But the roots of our attitude towards souls and the relation of souls to bodies lie deeper; they lie in those *primitive habits* of thought established, long ages before Locke and Hume, by early attempts to work out a scientific method. One of these primitive habits is that of adding, putting things together; and it is easy to understand the satisfaction realized in treating a complex thing as the result of adding part to part. This instinct and habit has led to some significant results in the history of science. For example, a hot body was understood as the body plus the heat. The heat itself was thought of as a kind of body, as something added to the body. When it was observed that heat did not increase the weight of the body, it was thought of as a vague kind of stuff called "caloric." Caloric was a body, but a mysterious sort of body. Finally it was found by experiment that heat is not something added to the body, but is the way the body behaves, the way its parts move. Now the accepted formula is, Heat is a mode of motion; motion, namely, of the particles which make up the body. So a hot body is explained, not as the additive result of body plus heat, but simply as a certain mode of behavior. So in the case of a "living body," there was a time when the living body was explained as body plus soul (psyche). Then, this soul became the "vital principle," and the living body was explained as body plus life; but the life itself remained a mystery, as it is for the unlightened biologists of the present day. But for some people, the Behaviorists, "a living body is a mechanism that behaves in a certain way." Life is no longer a thing to be inferred from behavior; it *is* behavior. "Disembodied life has been placed among the myths." This same mode of explanation applies to consciousness. Aristotle thought of

man as a rational animal; an animal plus a rational soul, "come from without."

> Descartes, close as he was to the theory that a living body is a mechanism behaving in a certain purposeful way, had yet to compose a human being of such a living body and a soul perched in the pineal gland. What is the difference between this and taking a real sweetheart as an automatic one plus an eject?

The author's parting words to the soul are these:

> To be sure the eject is not located, and the kind of individuality it may have is not specified; but therewith we have taken from the added-on soul the last thinkable trait it possessed. It has now the complete mystery of the meaningless. Have we not come to the point of realizing the meaninglessness of the mystery?

In short, the word, soul, is just simply meaningless. But observe, the author says that the soul, this "eject," is not located, and that its kind of individuality is not specified; and this to him is taking from "the added-on soul the last thinkable trait it possessed." Is not this saying, with Deussen and others, that only that which occupies space is real or thinkable? Would it not be pertinent here to ask how much space does the real sweetheart's love, or affection, or joy, or distress, or her idea of the lover, or her thought about him, occupy? It may be true to say that love is not thinkable or describable; but are we not safe in saying that "Love is the greatest thing in the world"? To take a simpler case: when I look at the blue sky, where is the blue before the elaborate processes of projection and distribution have taken place? It is certainly not the blue of a body, in the sense that the red is the red of the apple. It is not the blue of the ether waves reflected from particles in the atmosphere, nor is it the blue of the nerve current set up by the impinging waves, nor the blue of the brain centers, supposed to correspond with the mental state, the sensation. Unless our science of optics is all wrong, these are the physical conditions under which we have the sensation of color; but the color itself is not a physical, but a psychical fact. We may specify the physical conditions, but we can neither

produce nor locate the sensation in the physical world. Our knowledge of psychical facts is immediate; we arrive indirectly at a knowledge of physical objects. To say then, that the soul cannot be located, and therefore the word is meaningless, is to impose a materialistic test upon reality; and this is a long lived and obstinate absurdity.

Philosophy has always, at least from the day of Plotinus, recognized two contrasting views as to the nature of reality. The one tries to maintain that the real is and must be intelligible and describable, the other believes that ultimate reality is immediate experience, and as such is above, or prior to, relational thought and piece-meal description. The former are the intellectualists and the rationalists; the latter are the mystics. Modern philosophy is inclined to the view that experience is more or less both intellectualistic and mystic. Certainly we may say that experience is not yet completely rationalized,—at least by the human mind.

In spite of these materialistic suggestions, the author does not mean to be taken as an out-and-out materialist. The words life and soul have a meaning for him which is not in the strict sense mechanical behavior. He is aware that the attempt to treat mind as behavior raises the question as to what kind of behavior it is that enables us to call it conscious behavior. Just so we may ask, what kind of behavior it is that is characteristic of living beings; and then we may go on to define life as that which is common to the behavior of living beings. What, then, is this common feature of the behavior of living beings? In answering this question the author attempts to rid himself of the materialistic implications of the language he has been so far using. In doing this, he seems to be denying that mind is behavior, but only in the ordinary sense of the words. He has been presented with the case of the "passive thinker," and been asked how in that case can mind be behavior, when there is no observable behavior. His answer takes an interesting turn: "What I observe of his present behavior is not his thought; what I expect in the way of future behavior is not the full meaning of his thought." Then he goes on to what

may seem to be a sweeping denial of the whole doctrine of behaviorism. For the behaviorists profess to mean by behavior, not merely the outward bodily behavior, whether voluntary or involuntary, including language, gesture, signs, and so on, but everything that happens in the body,—the blood pressure, muscle tension, nervous discharge, etc. This is what Professor J. B. Watson takes infinite pains to demonstrate and declare. But now our author tells us somewhat cryptically, "What I might observe of the minutest mechanical changes in him is or is not his thought, as I view it." It would be worth while to live in the atmosphere of Professor Watson's science and philosophy long enough to breath freely in it; then Professor Singer's language would be all the more significant.

For Professor Singer, the universe of mind is distinguished from the universe of matter by characteristic behavior. Some objects may exist in various forms, but they have no common way of behaving. Triangles, for example, may be in the form of the geometer's diagram, or a drawing instrument, or a spear head; the mode of behavior in each case is different. Other objects may exist in various forms, but they all have a common mode of behavior, or a common characteristic of behavior. Time-pieces, for example, may be watches, clocks, sundial, or chronoscope; as time-pieces, they all have the characteristic of keeping time. At this point, we may introduce the word "purpose," and say in the one case that the various forms of the object have no one purpose, and in the other case that it is the common purpose that is characteristic of them all. The two groups here distinguished may be expanded to include material bodies, instruments, machines, and manufactures, on the one hand, and all objects characterized by purposive behavior, such as musical instruments, time-pieces, plants, animals, men, and angels, on the other. This classification, however, is disturbed by overlapping; instruments and machines appear in both groups. This is due to the fact that the word "purpose" is used ambiguously. If we compare the purposive behavior of time-pieces and plants, or animals, it is clear that time

keeping is not the purpose of the mechanism as such, but that of the maker; whereas the plant, or the animal, seems to work out its own purpose, the reproduction of its kind. In other words, a mechanism may be made to serve a purpose which it does not possess; but a living being has its own purpose. This affords a distinction between mechanical and living bodies. All physical bodies are mechanisms; some mechanisms lend themselves to purposes; some seem to have and express purposes of their own. These latter are the crucial cases, when we are dealing with the formula, "life is behavior." The question is, Are living bodies really mechanisms, or are they purposive beings? What the author says on this issue is well worth quoting, if only as a statement of his view.

> Materialism is nothing but an attempt to define life in terms of mechanism. It observes correctly enough that each living thing has at each moment a place in a class of mechanisms: it fails to observe how endlessly unlike these classes may be, and seeks to state what is common to them as a definition of *life*. But there is nothing in the way of mechanism common to all that is or might be called living, and the living would never be put in a single class were they not moments in a scheme of purpose: the class *living-being* has nothing but a certain purpose common to its members, and only this purpose can be offered as a definition of life.

There are several points of special significance in this statement. In the first place, it would seem to be meant as a refutation of materialism, by calling attention to the fact that, although every living thing has its place in a class of mechanisms, these classes themselves are endlessly unlike, and have in point of mechanism nothing in common: "there is nothing in the way of mechanism common to all that is or might be called living." In the second place, the statement calls attention to the significance of the concept of classes in the definition of life. It is the relation of classes that brings materialism to the test. The classes of mechanisms have as mechanisms nothing in common, and therefore life cannot be properly defined as what they have in common —which is the definition materialism has to offer. On the

other hand, it is what classes of mechanisms have in common as to purpose that constitutes the class of living beings, and furnishes the definition of life. This identifies life with purpose, but it leaves the meaning of purpose ambiguous. In the third place, the statement does not seem to lift us above the level of mechanisms; and the escape from materialism may be more seeming than real.

The author evidently feels this difficulty. He approaches the solution by observing that purpose involves freedom; and he defines freedom as the invariance of purpose in a variety of mechanical situations. Now the question is, If the world is a mechanical system, and bodies, living bodies as well, are mechanisms, how can we find a place for purpose and freedom in such a system? The author proposes an ingenious theory which aims to overcome the difficulty of conceiving freedom and purpose to be real in a mechanical universe. He admits that *points* in a mechanical universe cannot be free, but he maintains that groups of points can be. Now, he observes that a group of points may behave differently from the points which make up the group. We have a telling example of this in wave-motion. The ocean waves are made up of particles of water, and the particles move up and down, but the waves come dashing in upon the shore. The wave is a group of water particles moving up and down, and yet the wave moves independently in a horizontal direction. Here the author takes a bold step, and passes from waves in the universe of mechanical particles to waves in the universe of mechanisms, and imagines that through these mechanisms waves, pulses or impulses, move to some purpose, and the purpose is *self-preservation*. This is the pulse of life, and this is what characterizes the living being. This pulse is a type of group behavior, and is a new thing in the universe of mechanism; it cannot be defined or studied by the methods of mechanics. It must be defined in terms of purpose, and the purpose is that of self-preservation. "This new thing is *life*."

But if life cannot be mechanically defined, how can it be described; how can there be a science of life? This takes us

to the meaning of purpose. We usually think of purpose as the *desired* result. But we get into trouble when we try to carry this meaning of purpose over to the tree which grows, blossoms, and bears fruit, in order that another tree may result. For if we extend the meaning of desire to such cases, we make it equivalent to purpose taken as result. Now, presumably every event, every action, has results, and untold results. How then can we identify the result which is the purpose of the action? What is it that distinguishes the purpose of an act from its accidental results? Here we are driven to the statistical method, which is the scientific method *par excellence*. If an event happened but once, we could not recognize among its consequences that which was its purpose. So, too, if the event happened many times, and no one result was seen to be common to the cases, then again we should be unable to mark the purpose. We proceed, therefore, statistically to the average common result in a given class of cases; such a result we call the purpose of the act. This method is indeed scientific, but it is also mechanical; the result follows as a case of the "uniformity of nature," the basis of all mechanics. The result, too, is predictable, not of the individual cases, but only, by the law of probabilities, of a certain average number of cases.

> We may say then that the purpose of an event is the result which that type of event is *calculated* to accomplish; the calculus in question having for its data statistics, and for its methods the theory of probabilities (p. 68).

This, then, is the scientific method of determining what is common to the behavior of living beings; and this gives us a science of life. To find life, therefore, we look around among the happenings in the mechanical universe, and observe that common modes of behavior in certain classes of cases issue in self-preservation. This result is taken as the purpose of the behavior; so that self-preservation is the uniform and characteristic purpose of life. True, there are other purposes of life, more or less incidental or subsidiary, too numerous to mention or describe, but they are all of this

type; they are all results of modes of behavior common to classes of behavior.

Here we have an acute and closely reasoned statement of the behavioristic interpretation of life. It is a frank and deliberate contention that life is the behavior of mechanism, a mechanism of the kind to be subject to wave-like pulses, moving through it to certain average results. The mechanism is material in the same sense that the particles of water-waves and ether-waves are conceived to be material particles. The waves are material waves in the one case as in the other. In the case of living beings, the movements of the waves are in some mysterious fashion independent of the movements of the particles of the organism, however complicated the organism. Nevertheless, the waves themselves are in all cases the behavior of particles, and the particles are material particles, if we are right in saying that any particles are material. Why there are waves at all, we are not told. In the case of the water-waves, it is the dropping of the stone or the force of the wind that starts the waves. In the case of the ether-waves, it may be the agency of the sun. But what starts the organic waves? Possibly the air-waves and the ether-waves. In short, the author begins with and ends with a material and mechanical universe; his argument is materialistic and mechanistic throughout; his conclusion leaves us engulfed in mechanics. We have followed the argument closely because it is unusually clear and consistent. The conclusion is all the more significant for the failure of materialism.

So far it may seem that we have presented the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. It is true we have followed the treatment of mind as behavior, and as observable object. But we have not yet considered what we mean by mind as a characteristic of behavior. In justice to the author, we must take a glance at his method of distinguishing mind from life, and what it is that mind means for him. Life has been defined "without reference to its higher or lower forms." If we take these into consideration, we may identify the higher forms with mind. When we consider

the behavior of living beings, we observe differences due in the main to greater resourcefulness of some in comparison with others. If we want a formula, we should say, not that "this being is more resourceful than that because it has a mind the other lacks," but "this being has a mind the other lacks because it is more resourceful." It is these differences that lead us to distinguish mind from life.

Historically the difference of resourcefulness has been explained by giving some living beings sensibility and spontaneous motion. Spontaneity is evidence of will and of free activity. We ascribe sensibility to organisms according to the type of re-action. Organisms which re-act to colors are supposed to have sensations of color, and so with the other sensations. Sensations are said to have quality and intensity. The intensity of the sensation varies with certain *changes* in the stimulus. The sensation of heat is more intense when the furnace is at 150 than at 130. The quality of sensation varies with the *kind* of stimulus: air-waves give the sensation of sound: either-waves are supposed to give the sensation of light, etc. The nature of sensation gives rise to some of the fundamental problems of science and philosophy. In the first place, sensation is the rock upon which all materialistic and mechanistic theories are shattered. With all his boldness, our author does not go so far as to identify sensation with the stimulus, nor with the re-action to the stimulus. The re-acting organism has the sensation. He does, indeed, rather arbitrarily deny the sensation of heat to the *paramecium*, and yet with apparent inconsistency ascribes the sensation of discomfort to a still lower organism. He is not so much interested to treat sensation as behavior, as he is to displace it from the position of the fundamental basis of knowledge. Under the head of "Sensation and the Datum of Science" he discusses the immediacy of sensation, and the reality of the unit of sensation. His formula is: The problem of science is, not out of the "given" to construct the "world," but rather out of the "world" to construct the "given." This means that we do not begin with simple sensations to build up our knowl-

edge of the world, but we begin with the "blooming, buzzing confusion" of the world, and move towards the simple sensation. Sensation is not the datum of science.

We cannot, however attractive and profitable the task, follow the author in his discussion of the nature of experience and of science; nor shall we attempt to criticize the outcome. The author calls the discussion "Empirical Idealism"; but if he called it Radical Empiricism, or Pragmatism, or perhaps Neo-realism, it would do just as well. The main thesis is that Idealism must be brought to the test of experiment—to the test of experiment rather than experience, for the author is decidedly mathematical in his turn of mind and method of thinking.

The book needs and merits close and continuous, not to say repeated, reading. Those who take our science and our common sense, and even our philosophy, with a sense of finality, will receive some stimulating shocks, highly beneficial though for the moment disconcerting.

We disagree with the fundamental contentions of the book, but it would be beyond the province of this review to attempt to refute the positions in detail. We have pointed out the materialistic and mechanistic trend of the argument, and we take direct issue on the question of *immediacy*; but nevertheless we have found the book stimulating and profitable. We are glad to recommend it with these qualifications.

Lewis F. Hite.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE PLACE OF PHILOSOPHY IN RELIGIOUS TEACHING*

Philosophy holds the same place in religious teaching that it does in life. Just as life is interpreted by philosophy and directed by it—in so far as life is rationally guided—so religion and religious teaching are interpreted by philosophy and guided by it.

Religious teaching is teaching about life when life is lived in the sight of God, i.e., when God is acknowledged to be the source of life, and life itself in the highest sense is understood to be God.

Philosophy from the time of Pythagoras and Plato has meant the wisdom of life. More strictly and in the deepest sense philosophy is the wisdom of love, both the wisdom which is gained in the exercise of love, and the wisdom which clarifies and purifies, and rationalizes, love. Philosophy as the wisdom of life is universal; it applies to all grades, varieties, and branches of life. We have philosophy of nature, philosophy of mind, philosophy of conduct, philosophy of history, philosophy of business, philosophy of mathematics; in short, every department of life and of science has its appropriate philosophy. This fact has led to the perennial effort to distinguish between philosophy and science. The distinction is important, but more or less arbitrary and conventional. We try to say that science is systematized knowledge based upon observation and experiment, but we must add that every science, and in fact all rela-

*The body of this editorial appeared in an article entitled "Philosophy and Religion," in the *New-Church Messenger* of December 1, 1926. While for the most part incorporated herein, that article has been entirely rewritten for the present purpose.

tional knowledge, makes use of inference and implication. When we consider that inference and implication are precisely the tools which philosophy uses, we see that the transition from science to philosophy is easy, natural, and inevitable. Again, the attempt is commonly made to contrast description with explanation; accordingly, we speak of the descriptive sciences by way of contrast to explanatory science, or philosophy. But all description is so far explanation, and the further we push description the more complete the explanation.

Such considerations point to the historic difficulties in defining philosophy. Aristotle made the distinction between a knowledge of general principles and a knowledge of particulars and details, and philosophy has been defined as systematic knowledge of general principles. But for Aristotle, principles were causes, and so philosophy has been defined as the science of causes; and many have identified the knowledge of cause with explanation. Closer examination will show that these definitions and terms, though convenient, are more or less arbitrary.

Philosophy, of course, does deal with general principles; it is also systematized knowledge of a broader scope than the body of the special sciences. But there is nothing in the nature of things, certainly nothing in the nature of the scientist as a man, to prevent any special science from passing into philosophy. In other words, the scientist is always free and ready to question the presumptions of his science, and in doing this he at once begins to philosophize.

William James very aptly defined metaphysics as an unusually obstinate attempt to think clearly and consistently. This is a very happy characterization of philosophy. Philosophy is the task of systematic thinking. The attempt to think clearly leads to consistency, and consistency leads to system. A homely definition of philosophy is, to use a paraphrase of James' formula, an unusually obstinate attempt to say what you mean.

After all, philosophy is a very familiar and a very intimate procedure. Every man is a philosopher from the very fact, and in so far as, he is a rational being and is moved by rational instincts. This means that to be or not to be a philosopher is

not the question, but rather the question is what kind of a philosopher is one to be; a philosopher he must be whether good, bad, or indifferent. As soon as we begin to push our questions firmly and deliberately, we enter upon the business of philosophy.

The connection between science and philosophy suggests that philosophy is merely an extension of our common knowledge; and what is perhaps more significant and important, our common knowledge rests upon both science and philosophy for its facts and for its principles. It has been said, or might be well said, that the common knowledge of one age is but a precipitation of the science and philosophy of the preceding age. It would be hard to tell how much of the knowledge and the intellectual wealth of the present day go back to Plato and Aristotle. When we undertake to teach, we draw from the common store, and if we are to teach comprehensively and thoroughly, we must draw from the deep wells of the past. Philosophy is an ever widening and ever deepening stream of knowledge and light; by means of it we transform our raw experience into significant and intelligible life. To teach, as to live, progressively is to be more and more of a philosopher.

The place of philosophy in religious teaching, therefore, is like the place of philosophy in any teaching, precisely that of the application of broader principles and deeper insights to the interpretation of life than ordinary experience makes habitual use of. Religion is first in time a body of doctrine, but first in essence a form of faith. Doctrine is not vital religion until it is quickened by faith and lighted up by reason. When doctrine, so quickened and enlightened, is made the rule of conduct, then religion descends into practical life and attains its completeness.

If we glance at religion historically, we find many fantastic doctrines and beliefs. They are usually extravagant and unrationalized developments of perfectly normal features of religion. All have more or less practical value or effect; some of them lead to vain and hurtful excesses, such as human sacrifice and the worship of idols. Religion may be abused and perverted in numberless ways. Exaggeration and disproportion

are characteristic of the Protestant movement; and the religious temper of the present day is to some extent a re-action against the outcome of these tendencies.

Any one of the elements of religion may be exaggerated at the expense of the others. Faith may be so emphasized that doctrine and conduct become relatively unimportant and rejected, as in the case of salvation by faith alone. Or doctrine may be so disproportionately developed that faith and practice are lost sight of, and the doctrine becomes a mere form, as the doctrine of the tripersonality of the Godhead. On the other hand, conduct may be so exclusively the object of attention and importance, that both faith and doctrine are neglected and disparaged, as is now the tendency under the formula "Religion is life." These tendencies and results are due to the narrowness and exclusiveness of attention and interest, and can only be corrected by deliberate effort to think clearly and comprehensively. This effort leads to both philosophy and higher education. These are twin achievements; higher education leads to philosophy and is guided by philosophy.

From the point of view of education, religious teaching is fundamental. Children need to be taught religion, just as they need to be taught history, or the languages and the sciences. All teaching is more or less doctrinal and dogmatic; necessarily and properly so in religion as in other subjects. Doctrines point the way to faith and conduct. Religious doctrines are needed to direct the mind to the proper objects of faith and to the duties of life under religious requirements. Religious teaching centers about the character of God, and the qualities of the life that proceeds from Him. The character of God as Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, as the Source of all life, is recognized and taught as the meaning of religious experience. The Love, Wisdom and Power of God are what, in general constitute the life which operates in creation at large, and especially in the regeneration of men. The nature of God is revealed in His Word and in His World, but instruction about the Word and the world is needed to enable us to see what is revealed. Revelation does not come to an empty and uninformed mind; this is the enduring reason, and the supreme

reason, for higher education and for philosophy. This instruction must take account of false ideas and bad habits, as well as of imperfections. It must guide us through history, through literature, and through the sciences, with a firm faith and a steady light. Men have always needed this kind of instruction, but never more than now. Religious faith is questioned, weakened, and rejected, as never before. Many people deliberately and intolerantly cast off their religious faith as a fictitious heritage, while at the same time they hold on with passionate determination to their faith in their own fantasies, their faith in the guesses of the higher critics, and their faith in the hypotheses of the scientists, as if these were immediate deliverances of absolute truth, which they profess to desire above all things.

Philosophy helps us to bring to the test of critical reflection the principles, the methods, and the results of our teaching. This is true in every branch of teaching, in the field of history and science, as well as in religious teaching. Religious teaching which aims at completeness, and at removing the fundamental hindrances to faith and love must make use of the most critical and the most systematic philosophy. It must, of course, begin and end with teaching doctrines—doctrines about life, doctrines about God, man, and the world. But with the growth of knowledge and insight, the fuller meaning of these doctrines must be taught to meet growing demands, rational and practical.

It is true that simple doctrines may very properly be presented to naive faith, and through doctrine thus accepted, faith may become operative and effective. This is the case with children, and even with older people. Much satisfactory progress can be made in this way. On the other hand, many feel and believe that in such cases at least philosophy would do more harm than good; that to introduce philosophical questions and considerations would cause disturbance and distress, perplexity and doubt, discouragement and disappointment. We should face the facts here, and appreciate that much harm of this kind has been done in the past and is likely to be done in the future. But as to this it may be pertinently said that the

harm has been done by crude and untrained attempts at philosophizing, not by philosophy in the proper sense. The remedy here is not less but more philosophy. It would be a grave and disastrous mistake to suppose, and to act on the supposition, that religious teaching and philosophy are by nature mutually antagonistic to each other. Whatever seeming antagonism there is has been produced by doctrinal and philosophical errors and imperfections. Perhaps a caution is due here in view of the many contrasting philosophies which are contending for supremacy and acceptance. This "Strife of Systems" is often pointed to as a standing reproach and scandal incurred by the whole philosophizing undertaking. It is easy to exaggerate this feature of philosophical enquiry and teaching; it is due primarily to the complexity of life and the world. The same differences and conflicts are seen in all departments of knowledge and practice. Atomic theories, evolution theories, theories of disease and cure, economic theories, and so on, exhibit the same variety and contrasts. Ideal philosophy like ideal science would be all-comprehensive and thoroughly consistent, but philosophers, like scientists, are only men, though men of extraordinary powers; they can only know those aspects of the world and experience that are severally presented to them. A few men like Aristotle, Leibniz, and Swedenborg were able to cover with a fair degree of completeness the whole field of knowledge, but this is becoming more and more beyond the range of even the greatest minds. The sciences have been so developed by specialists that it is the work of a lifetime to master a single department, with the world of fact and experience still to be explored. It is not therefore a reproach to philosophy that it is not complete nor thoroughly consistent; its merit is that it is becoming more consistent and approaching completeness. Philosophers agree as well as disagree, and so do philosophical systems. The effect is to enlarge our body of common intelligence, and to stimulate further search for truth. We cannot, then, even if we would, do without philosophy; we may, as some do, condemn philosophy in general and at the same time appropriate some particular philosophy. We should keep an open mind to philosophy and appreciate our constant

dependence upon it. If possible we should make the direct acquaintance of some of the great philosophers of the world.

In the very nature of the case, therefore, philosophy must come to the aid of religious teaching. But the circumstances of our time make this really indispensable to the religious teaching which is now called for. The atmosphere and influences of modern life, created by and operating through the press, the theatre, and common talk, have moulded public opinion and produced a state of mind unfavorable, if not hostile, to religious teaching—a state of mind more or less frivolous, self-indulgent, self-assertive, self-reliant, and self-confident, which is apt to resent any appearance of direction or control other than that of nature and man, and which is disposed to reject religious teaching as vainly authoritative, arbitrary, and unnatural. This state of mind must be approached with philosophical analysis of the presuppositions which lie back of it, and with a critical examination of current views and opinions which give form and significance to it. When the superficialities of popular thought have been exposed, and the naturalism and materialism of the presuppositions have been brought to light, then religious teaching and philosophy may join hands in a higher and more liberal education. Higher and more liberal education is the great problem of the present day. Advanced teaching has become so specialized and technical that common knowledge and history are left behind, and science in the broad sense is too much neglected. The curricula of our colleges and universities are crammed with special courses, along with some rapid surveys. Concrete nature and the general body of knowledge are rarely touched. Education is moving away from life to general abstract theory. Our young people go through the system with scarcely a ripple on the surface of their common life or a beam of light upon their common knowledge, without developing tastes or aptitudes for literature, history, or science, but with an exaggerated sense of the importance and authority of "advanced views." One of the desiderata of educational progress is thoroughgoing criticism of scientific methods and results. Much that is paraded under the name of established science is the mere theorizing of partially educated

specialists, lacking an adequate background of literature, history, and philosophy, and even of the total body of science. The theories of today are displaced by the theories of tomorrow.

A liberal education should, of course, be abreast of the most advanced theories of the specialists, but after all, the result to which education should lead is to put one in the position to understand men, to make use of history, to live in the light of the present day with all the advantages of the past, to do his work in the world as a man and also as a good tool, or an expert technician. The individual may with extraordinary effort and abilities attain much of this education by solitary, well directed industry, but people in general, especially young people, do not and will not go so far without the assistance of a body of highly equipped teachers who as a body at least know history, literature, science, and philosophy, and who make religion the central motive and feature of their teaching. We may give free rein to the motive and purpose of scientific investigation and formulation—fact for fact's sake, truth for truth's sake—but after these motives have been exhausted, we still have life for life's sake. But life for life's sake will take us ultimately to God for God's sake. In other words, living a complete life includes religion.

Religious teaching is, for us at least, concerned with the Bible, with doctrines derived from the Bible, and with the life which the doctrines prescribe. For New-Church people, especially, and for all Bible teachers more or less, teaching the Bible involves a knowledge of Correspondences, which lead from the literal to the spiritual meaning. The fact and the law of Correspondence, to be fully appreciated and properly used, must be understood to be universal, as the relation in general between the natural world and the spiritual. This at once takes us into the field of philosophy, and involves us in the most difficult of philosophical problems, the nature of spirit, the nature of matter, and the nature of the relation between mind and body. When it is said, for example, that the sun corresponds to love and the moon to faith, this may be taken as a statement of fact, and accepted as such without further question. But if it is asked, what does the statement mean, the

answer will lead to all the complexities and difficulties of physics, psychophysics, psychology, and further into the philosophy of nature and of mind. Some who are familiar with the language of correspondences are offended at being asked such questions; they think that the meaning is obvious. But the one who undertakes to give religious instruction must not only expect, but should invite such questions, and be ready to answer them, even though it involves advanced education in philosophy and science, and in history and literature. It is vain to say that this is impracticable and that under this requirement there would be no teachers. The constant criticisms we hear of Sunday School teaching and of the alleged poor results, really point to the same requirement. It simply means that we must be more in earnest about teaching religion and be willing to make due preparation for it, which would be no more than a preparation for life in the fullest sense.

We have in Swedenborg's writings and in the Bible a large body of doctrines on the matter of religious teaching, but these doctrines need to be interpreted and understood before they can be fully serviceable for teaching and for life. It is true that verbal answers may be given to many, if not to all, such questions and they seem to give complete satisfaction to some, and momentary satisfaction to many; but such teaching does not satisfy growing and eager rationality. In such cases, religious teaching cannot, and really does not, stop short of philosophy—the philosophy may be explicit, it may be crude, it may be elaborate, but it is, in one or the other of these ways, unavoidable.

On the other hand, religious teaching, like all teaching, even rationality itself, must presuppose and depend upon faith and insight. But faith and intuition, though fundamental, actually operate in a context, or in a situation. This means that faith, intuition, and reason, must go together to get the desired results; they exist separate only as abstract concepts, for which we have words, and the words enable us to talk about them; but if we stop to think what we mean, we are at once taken to the concrete situations where they operate conjointly. This is another way of saying that philosophy and religious teaching

at their best must go together. Philosophy in the largest and in the proper sense is the philosophy of the universe; and the universe contains nature, spirit, and God. Philosophy, historically speaking, is a growing understanding of the universe, and in particular, these three great features of the universe.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE HEART OF THE INCARNATION'S MEANING

The REVIEW comes out, too early when in October and too late when in January, to allow a quite timely reference to Christmas. Yet, like any religious periodical, it may feel very much prompted by the anniversary to say something. Is it too late to consider some of the meanings of Christmas?

Christmas never comes and goes without doing more than we can calculate to proclaim the message of the Gospel, or to enhance the "good news," or to confront us all with the Christ. A custom like that of celebrating Christmas is weighted with the accumulated worship of the ages, and it bends upon an increasingly significant event the attention and adoration of men and women of many minds and many lands. The steady beat of it in the calendar is slowly unifying, and evangelizing.

In the way of facts, more is represented in Christmas than is often realized. Of course, there is the fact that the long awaited Messiah, though most of His people refused to see Him for such, was born then. The historicity of Jesus has weathered all assaults. A Jesus was born at Bethlehem who lived an amazing career in Palestine. It is also historical fact that an expectation was strong for centuries, among the Jewish people, of One anointed above His fellows, and this expectation brought even representatives of other peoples to Jesus's door, there to be satisfied in Him. This was true pre-eminently of the lone "Wise Men." It became true of the Gentiles, who learned of the expectation of a Messiah when they first learned of Him. Just the birth of One Who so altered the face of things, and steadily moved towards the possession of the hearts of men, commands awe at Christmas-time, and joy, all around the earth. We do not have to be making any very commanding

interpretation of the Person of the Lord, or to be passing beyond what took place, beyond the birth of Jesus, beyond the fact that it was awaited in the light of a great historical and national hope, or beyond the fact that a life was ushered in which outwent the hope, and as an historical fact has proved the most powerful of forces in the elevation of the human race. Will not the birth of such an One be more and more widely hailed as the years go by, and with more and more reason?

In our thought for Christmas we do not leave fact for interpretation quite as soon as might be supposed. It seems as though when we go on to add that we celebrate the Incarnation of God in Jesus, not just the birth of one Jesus, that we have left the historical fact for a theological explanation of what happened. If only we who are celebrating the event now were concerned, or others at a distance of time, that would be true; the birth as a Divine Incarnation would be a fact only so interpreted by us. Indeed, whether God was incarnated in the Christ became a matter of interpretation the moment Jesus had withdrawn from sensible presence among men. To Paul it was interpretation, to Clement of Alexandria, to Augustine of Hippo, to all Christians after the glory of the Lord's life had passed across the sight of men. Religious insight, reflection, some of the spirit's powers of appreciation, it would be, that, going to work on the fact of the Christ, made of it this marvelous thing, that when He was born God was incarnated. If it were not for some other men still, the sheer, uninterpreted fact behind Christmas would be that Jesus, a little Babe, was born, at Bethlehem, to Mary, and to Joseph, who at least was foster-father to the Child.

But the Incarnation is a fact as well as the birth and is as well established in the records. The Incarnation of God in Christ was fact to many who had to do with the Lord. On our part, at this distance, it may be interpretation only. If in religious experience, moreover, it is fact to us that we have God in Christ, still that form of the fact has only an inner existence; to the early followers of the Lord, however, the fact had outward existence and evidence, just as their Master had

outward existence to them. It therefore came within the possible notice of history, a fact history could record. To many of the disciples God was present in Christ, tabernacled in Him, John says, and uniquely so. That was an experienced fact in their lives. It got worded by Peter in His confession of the Christ. It finally struck from the doubting Thomas his whole-souled acknowledgment, "My Lord and My God." What was a sensible fact to the disciples, became a piece of history, not simply a theological interpretation of a birth and life. Browning makes John in his great old age speculate what will happen when the days come when the Incarnation will perforce be a matter of interpretative insight.

> If I live yet, it is for good, more love
> Through me to men: be naught but ashes here
> That keep awhile my semblance, who was John—
> Still, when they scatter, there is left on earth
> No one alive who knew (consider this!)
> —Saw with his eyes and handled with his hands
> That which was from the first, the Word of life.
> How will it be when none more saith, "I saw"?

No, to these men the Incarnation of God in Christ was fact.

> And the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Or, again,

> That . . . which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life—that declare we unto you.

And the experience of these men is history.

The fact that thrilled the shepherds and drew the Wise Men from a distance—the birth of Christ—goes to inspire Christian song, and to inspire the rejoicing of His followers at Christmas. So also does the fact which over-awed disciples and entered into their very sensation—the incarnation of God in Him. For very many, Christmas is not as fully Christmas as with only historic justification it may be, if the birth story is not an incarnation story.

How shall one begin to say, then, what the Incarnation means, as the reason of Christmas joy?

There are the more habitual ways of summing up the meaning of the Incarnation in the terms of what was done during the Lord's incarnate life, and by means of His incarnate life. We are in the habit of saying that He came to do two things.

One object of the Incarnation was a vast work in the whole environment of human life. Follow the Lord about in His ministry, and He cures now and again the diseased bodily life of some one. Or He frees a mind of its traditional trammels. Or He seeks to alter the spirit of His country's most significant native institutions, or the fixed habit of a whole generation. So much and more takes place in Palestine. It has farther-reaching effect. Even in these ways the world in which a human life found itself was being changed for the better. But from the very outset of His ministry the Lord is setting victims, free from some malign influence which He ascribes to the unseen world. By His own account He is doing battle with the powers of darkness, and with the prince of this world, until Satan falls as lightning from heaven. There is a world which He is overcoming, plain enough in Palestine, but with its reaches in the invisible world. There is an environment which makes against our best life—a fraction and visible bit of it in a Palestinian village, the indefinite extent of it in the world of spirit. The whole environmental world He is setting right. That is part of the Incarnation's meaning (if one puts it in terms of what was done). God Incarnate, at grips with our own world and moral problem, as He could be only in looking out on these through a human consciousness, puts the world deceptive and degrading to our life under subjection, for our freer seeking of the true life of the spirit. Sweep the Lord's life in the world and try to summarize what was done, and the total deed comes near being half-told when one says that the Lord effected a far-reaching readjustment of the whole environment of the human will and spirit to give Christian aspiration room and help. Rehearse His teachings, tell the story of His healing ministry, trace His opposition to institution and sect, and you only disperse this total deed among the activities

of His colorful ministry. Part of the Incarnation's meaning is that God set His house in order for a new era.

But then there was that profound, indeed unfathomable, change in the nature in which He was Incarnate. That was the other thing that happened during the Incarnation, and by means of it. The Lord had to build in Him what He built around Him. If He marshaled the influences for right and the true in the environment of the human spirit, He marshaled them in His own breast first, and giving them dominance there bore them to victory everywhere, i.e., enabled them to play freely on the human spirit. If there was a public struggle which He had to wage with the whole world hostile to our best life, He began in a private struggle with it in His own Person. There the public struggle pivoted. There the world battle was concentrated. He had to rise above misshapen human inheritance in His own Person. He had to fight all in Him which was not of God. In Christ God had answered the prayer, "Look down from heaven, and behold and visit this vine which Thou hast planted." In His own assumed humanity the Christ had to alter the human stock. Branches in Him that were unfruitful were to be cut away. Branches that bore fruit, were purged to bring forth more fruit. Or to use the other figure of speech which He Himself employed, He was to live in this same tenement which is ours, dilapidated, at the mercy of gusts of passion, awry in instinct and imagination, and was to re-fashion it, to re-build, to sanctify, to glorify it. He was to turn it, as it existed in His own Person, into God's Temple. Ideally it was God's Temple in any man. But over a long stretch of unspiritual living it had been destroyed. In an incredibly brief time He raised again the Temple which had been ruined. Decidedly this is a momentous, a profound part of the Incarnation. The Incarnation was gradual, and not only cumulative, but everlasting. God did not tabernacle temporarily in our humanity. He did not lodge in it for a space, and then recede. He made the humanity over in the full image of God. He made it of His own substance (to put the fact with some of its unfathomableness). He kept it for touch with men. Decidedly this second work in the very Person of

Jesus was part of the Incarnation's meaning. Obviously the Incarnation was supremely the opportunity for just that.

Now, one might think that one was at the heart of the significance of the Incarnation in thus putting its meaning in terms of what was done during the Incarnation and by means of it. Christ mastered our human environment in our behalf, an environment which the Infinite can feel directly only Incarnate. Perfectly the Christ put into the Divine image our human nature, which again could be done only where God was already uniquely lodged in it. These are vast meanings for the Incarnation to bear. Yet one can venture to say even so they are not the heart of the Incarnation's meaning. These things happened in the Incarnation. Are we not going to get more nearly at the Incarnation's meaning if we can say what followed from the event, what followed from the things done? What were these cosmic happenings in the Incarnate life to serve? What was it all for? Quite obviously not for the sake of the Infinite Himself; not for Christ's sake. Why did He glorify His humanity save that human nature might be started upward toward God again—toward all that is true and beautiful and good? "And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth" (*John* xvii. 19). And why lay the human environment, seen and unseen, under a completer subjection still, if not to make room for Christian aspiration to move in? "In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." The heart of the Incarnation's meaning is still further to seek: in these things for the sake of which the Lord wrought redemption, for the sake of which He glorified His human nature and Person.

Can the heart of the Incarnation's meaning be put more succinctly than to say that the Incarnation opened the way to further and increasing incarnation of the Divine in human beings? All human life was to have God in. Never in the full measure of the Lord Himself, Who in His own Person was God Manifest. But men were to have God in, tabernacling in them, continuing to win victories over hostile influence and environment, once more transforming a human nature for His indwelling. That was to be the upshot. The one Son of God

was to be succeeded by innumerable sons of God. The Fourth Gospel keeps urging this for the heart of the Incarnation's meaning. It represents the glorified Lord praying, "I in them, and Thou in Me, that we may be made perfect in one" (xvii. 23). John does not omit the thought altogether from the statement of his purpose in writing the Gospel, "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name" (xx. 31). At the heart of his poem on how the Word which was with God, and was God, became flesh, John has placed a sentence which seems to be at the heart of the Incarnation's meaning. "As many as received" the Word made flesh,

> To them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

The one supreme life in which God was tempted without flaw, was to be followed, and was for the purpose that it might be followed, by an unending and spreading line of lives also the scenes and servants of God's indwelling presence and power.

William F. Wunsch.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE VISION OF THE HOLY CITY

The Book of Revelation is a Divine representative drama, enacted in the spiritual world and witnessed by John in spiritual vision. It is a prophetic description in the language of symbol and in symbolic vision of what would take place as a result of the opening of the "Seals of the Book," that is, the unfolding and making known to men the spiritual meaning of the Bible. The acts and scenes of this drama were not the real spiritual events which the words of this Book were meant to reveal and describe, but they were prophetic representations of events which were to take place in the future. John was in the spirit when he saw and heard these things; the drama was enacted in the outward scenery of the spiritual world before the eyes of his spirit. The vision John saw took place way back in the first century of the Christian era, in the lifetime of one of the Lord's disciples; the fulfilment, the real events, took place little over a century and a half ago, when the Lord taught Swedenborg the spiritual meaning of the Bible. It was then that the Lord made His Second Coming, executed the Last Judgment, and began the establishment of the New Jerusalem. The fulfilment is the revelation, made by and in the writings of Swedenborg and the inner meaning of the Word to the spiritual intelligence of men and angels, of the nature and character of the Glorified Jesus; it was the entrance into men's minds and hearts of the new knowledge and the new spirit which came with the opening of the Seals of the Book.

Christian people have seen in this vision a prophetic description of what human life would be at "the end of the world" after the "Last Judgment," when the Lord should come again and reign on the earth. They have thought of the New Jerusalem as the Lord's final and perfected Church on the earth,

when sin and sorrow would be no more, and joy and goodness abound. This interpretation is quite right so long as it rests in these general terms, but when the attempt was made to go beyond this, and be more definite about all the particulars of the description of the Holy City, they went astray very widely and came into the greatest confusion.

But now, since the Lord has opened the Seals of the Book, the case is different. Up to this time, Christians erred in the same way the Jews of old did; and as the disciples themselves did, when they sighed "We trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel." In the face of His example, and in spite of His teachings, they misinterpreted the prophecies of His advent, and expected Him to come as the King of the Jewish nation and to set up His temporal kingdom at Jerusalem. They had heard Him say "My kingdom is not of this world," "the kingdom of heaven is within you." As much as to say My kingdom is the kingdom of the spirit. But because He did not come as their temporal king, the Jews rejected Him; and because He did not set up a temporal kingdom at Jerusalem, His disciples thought that His mission had failed, and for a time gave up in despair, seeing that He had been overcome by His enemies. He had to come to them again after the Resurrection to assure them of his victory, to "open their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures." They had taken the Scriptures literally, when they were meant spiritually.

Just so, the Christians have mistaken the prophecies of the Second Coming and the establishment of the New Jerusalem. They have made the same mistakes the Jews and the disciples made. They have expected, and many do now expect, Him to come again as king over all the earth. Some expect that He will set up His throne at Jerusalem, and make that His Holy City. This is a sad and mischievous error. It has taken the spirit out of the Word of God, and made it little more than a dead letter. It has split up Christians into petty and warring sects, each emphasizing some literal interpretation, each struggling to maintain the supremacy of its own interpretation, with little spiritual light or life. They have passed by unheeded the momentous words "the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh

alive." They have exemplified that the letter killeth, they must now, hard though it be, turn to the spirit that maketh alive.

In spite of the difficulties involved in detailed development, we may say in general that one simple great principle divides Christians into the natural minded and the spiritual minded. This is the great principle of interpretation that the Bible has within and above the letter a distinct, clear, and complete spiritual meaning. Those who ignore or reject this principle are natural minded Christians; those who accept it and read the Bible in the light of it, have the spirit of the New Age and the light of it.

The Lord knows how hard it is for men to raise their eyes from earth to heaven, how difficult it is for them to look through nature to the spirit within. We see what little progress His own chosen disciples made, how hard it was for them, even with the advantage of daily contact with Him and of His regular and constant instruction, to see the true spirit and meaning of His words and of His life. The Jews failed entirely to see it. Nearly eighteen centuries of hard discipline and steady unremitting instruction were needed to prepare the Christian world for the beginnings of this step from nature to spirit in Christian thought and life. The Lord knew from the first how it would be. He understood the treatment He received from the Jews, and the slowness of heart of the disciples. He has been infinitely patient with His people, and has given them His Divine aid at every step. So early as within the life-time of His beloved disciple, John, He gave His people this beautiful vision of the Holy City, as a promise that He would in His own good time, as they were prepared, lift them up into the light of the spirit, and bring them into the New Jerusalem.

John saw the Holy City in prophetic vision; we may now look about us and see the New Jerusalem descending from God out of heaven, as a living fact. If we read this vision in the light of the spirit, we can see that the promise has been fulfilled. These are the signs: within the last century and a half men have learned more fully the meaning of the word, *humanity*. They have learned to see in clearer light that "the Lord is good to all," and that "His tender mercies are over all

His works"; that "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sendeth rain on the just and upon the unjust." This universal love the Lord brought to men when He came in the flesh, but men could receive but little of it; they could not understand it nor interpret it. Now we are beginning to see more of its true quality, and to interpret the Bible and human life in the light of it. We are beginning to see that the life of this love alone is salvation; that the Church without the life of this love cannot save and that faith without this life is dead. This is what the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ in His Word has taught men, and this teaching has lifted them out of the mists of the world up into the light of heaven. If we turn to this vision of the Holy City, and read the description of the New Jerusalem in the light of the spiritual meaning, it will be luminous with the clear and beautiful light of heaven, and will set before us truly the perfected life of humanity.

As we read, we must think not of a city made with hands and seen with our bodily eyes, but of states of human life, of affections of human hearts and thoughts of human minds. These are the things which are precious in the Lord's sight; these are the things His Holy Word teaches us about when we read: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." We must think above the sea and earth and heaven which we behold with our eyes; we must think of the inner life of the human spirit. We must look around us, and out into the wide world and back into history, and try to see the inner life of men, what they think and how they feel. The thoughts and feelings, the motives and purposes and efforts of men, are first of all and most of all the things which the Bible means to tell us of.

Our thoughts and feelings about our bodily life and about the things of nature around us, the Bible calls "the earth"; in other words, by earth is meant our natural life. But our thoughts and feelings about the Lord's love and wisdom, about the life of the angels, and about the life possible to us from the Lord, the Bible calls heaven. This is what the Lord means when He says "the kingdom of heaven is within you." Of course, heaven in the larger sense is the state of life of all

angels and spiritually minded men. We are in that state, too, when our minds and hearts are filled with heavenly thoughts and affections. So when the Bible speaks of heaven and earth, it means the spiritual and natural states of human life.

The first heaven and the first earth which John saw pass away were the imperfect spiritual and the natural states of human life, which grew out of the erroneous and perverted interpretation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the progress of the Christian Church.

The new heaven and the new earth, which John saw, represented and foretold the new human life that would come with the new teaching from the Lord's Word.

According to the old interpretation, Jesus Christ was the Son of God in the merely natural sense, as Isaac was the son of Abraham; and when He ascended on high, He sat on a throne at the right hand of God the Father and acted as the personal Mediator between God and man.

According to the new spiritual teaching, Jesus Christ was and is the Divine Man; His Humanity was the Son of God in the same sense that a man's body and its life is the son of his spirit and its life; He was also the Son of God in the sense that a man's thought is the son of his love, as we say, "the wish is father to the thought," this is a spiritual relation; and the relation of Father to Son in the Lord is a spiritual relation, not the natural relation of two separate persons to each other. When the Lord Jesus ascended on high, He sat on the one throne of heaven, as God over all; our heavenly Father, the supreme Ruler of the universe, and the Judge of men. We *may* think of him in the natural way as the Divine Person sitting on the throne of heaven, as he is described in the natural language of the Vision of the Throne, but the new teaching of the spirit enables us to think of Him as the Divine Love, Wisdom, and Power which moves and guides and operates the universe, and is the source of the love, wisdom, and power of human life. This is to think of Him spiritually; this is to think of the Divine qualities of His life.

According to the old interpretation, the Bible is a book of literal history and prophesy, with a mixture of figure and

symbol. The history is personal or national, and the prophesy demands literal fulfilment.

According to the new interpretation, the Bible is the Book of Divine and human life. It is, indeed, with the exception of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, a book of literal history, and it is a book of prophesy, but the history and the prophesy have a spiritual meaning and fulfilment. It is God's word to man's spirit and it teaches man the operation of the spirit. It gives men spiritual knowledge and instruction about God and heaven, and human life.

Under the old interpretation, the Christian world formed natural ideas, partly imperfect and partly erroneous, about God, about heaven, and about human life. These ideas gave character and form to Christian teaching and living, both natural and spiritual. The first heaven spoken of here in the Book of Revelation is the spiritual life and the first earth is the natural life, so produced. The new heaven and the new earth are the kinds of spiritual and natural life that develop under the influence of the new teaching.

When we read "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away," we must take what was seen as a prophetic vision foretelling that the first Christian understanding of the Lord's life and teachings would be imperfect and erroneous, and would pass away; and with this understanding would go the specific customs and habits and practices and life that grew out of it; and that then would come in the place thereof a new Christian understanding and life based on the new understanding of the spiritual sense of the Bible.

We have only to look back and see the changes that have gone on in Christian thought and life for the past century and a half to be strongly convinced that the prophesy is being fulfilled, and that we are now living in the new age. The whole body of this new teaching of the spiritual truth of the Bible as it is taking form in the mind of mankind is the New Jerusalem, the Holy City, which John saw in prophetic vision descending out of heaven from God.

The foundations of the wall of the city are the great funda-

mental principles of this new teaching; here are some of them: The Bible has a spiritual meaning, the meaning imparted by the use of the law of correspondence, is one. The Lord has made known this spiritual meaning to men by opening the seals of His Book, is another. Another is that the spiritual meaning of the Bible *teaches* as its supreme truth that the Lord Jesus Christ is the one Divine Person and the one only God, who sits on the throne of heaven the Ruler of the universe and the Judge of men, the one Source of all life and blessing to men. The spiritual meaning of the Bible also teaches as one of the foundation stones that the Lord's life in the flesh accomplished two supreme results: He overcame the powers of evil and thereby redeemed the human race from bondage to sin, and He glorified the humanity which He assumed and thereby became man's Divine Protector and Saviour, and is evermore our heavenly Father. Another teaching which is also a foundation stone is that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Divine trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the three one in Him as soul, mind, and body are one in us, or better as affection, thought, and act are one in every deed we do. In Him the Divine Love is the Father, the Divine Wisdom is the Son, and the Divine Operation is the Holy Ghost. These three are the one Divine Person which He is.

On these foundation stones, the walls of the New Jerusalem are built to protect the life of the city. They are precious stones, too, for through them the Divine Wisdom of the Word shines, and the Divine qualities of the Lord's Love are revealed. The wall, great and high, is for us what men know from the spiritual teaching of the Bible about the Lord's Divine Power to protect them from evil and keep them in good. All those who have had some experience of the Lord's Divine Power to save and to protect, have the material out of which to build the wall of the Holy City. They know how easy it is with this power to shun the evil and to choose the good; they know that "peace which passeth all understanding," and that joy of heart which the free activity of love brings. The Lord's own teaching from the spiritual sense of His Word about His power to protert the souls of men from evil and error, and to

keep them in truth and good, when taken into the minds of men and seen to rest on the great foundation stones, or these great principles, is the wall of the Holy City, and makes all this experience of safety, freedom, and peace possible to us, makes the life of the city free, happy, and prosperous.

The Gates of Pearl are the Lord's teaching in the spiritual sense of His Word about the safety and peace of those who come to Him in spirit and in truth. The knowledge of the Lord's power to save is the gate by which every one must enter the New Jerusalem. "Look unto Me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else," is a pearly gate. "Take My yoke unto you and learn of Me, and I will give you rest," is another. When we know that the Lord Jesus Christ is speaking these words to us, and that He has all power in heaven and on earth to save and to bless, we know the way into the New Jerusalem. When we have had some experience of the peace that comes with His deliverance of us from evil, this knowledge is a gate of pearl.

"The Streets of Gold" are the ways of good life in the Holy City. In the Holy City, the ways of good life are seen to be full of the Lord's pure unselfish love for others, and they reveal this love and interpret it to others.

When men live from this love, when they feel it in their hearts and express it in their tones of voice and in their actions, in the deeds of daily life; when they see in the spiritual meaning of the Bible the Lord's own description of it, and can in the light of the spirit recognize the qualities of it and delight to realize these qualities in their own lives; when they are wise with the wisdom of it and strong with the strength of it; when, finally, they do the deeds of it; then the New Jerusalem will be established upon the earth, and the Vision of the Holy City will be fulfilled in our eyes. Then "the Tabernacle of God will be with men, and He will dwell with them and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God."

The spirit of the Lord's unselfish love is the spirit of the New Jerusalem.

Lewis F. Hite.

GOING ABOUT THE DEEPER SENSE OF SCRIPTURE

Methods of good workmanship have an unusual importance when the matter in hand is the deeper sense of Scripture. The case of such a deeper sense labors under difficulties enough as it is. It is no small task to show that such a sense exists. We think it is enough to proceed and set it out, but to the student who comes to his conclusions a step at a time, it is not clear that something has not been read into Scripture which is not there. Again, it is only too easy to be diverted to some one singular item in the deeper sense, to the detriment of letting it be seen that the deeper sense is vital and substantial. And there is finally the whole question whether due method is employed, or whether what is offered is only what allegorizing fancy might at any time have produced, given, not any knowledge of symbol and thing symbolized to go upon, but simply full rein.

We have had in many other mental undertakings the maxim that one does well to get "generals" in hand first, then to proceed to detail, and at last to bring up again with the fulness of one's accumulated freight in re-inforced general statements and views. It is a general procedure which has held good with subject after subject. There is no reason to make it the exclusive procedure. On the other hand, it is a thorough way of working. Having proved itself in many other fields, it may well do as efficiently in the field of the interpretation of the spiritual sense of Scripture.

Yet when one examines those books in our collateral literature which attempt interpretation of the spiritual sense of a book of the Bible, is there any example of this way of proceeding? Do authors stop to find out what *Daniel* (if it is *Daniel* that they are writing on) is about in general in the spiritual sense before starting on detailed interpretation? How can they make their way with any assurance or with any large connectedness among the details of interpretation if they have not taken in a general picture first of the book's message in its deeper sense? We have interpretations by our collateral writers of the Book of *Deuteronomy*, for example, of the

Books of *Kings*, of *Joel*, of *Daniel*, of *Leviticus*, of *Numbers*, of *Judges*, and doubtless these works are too little known and utilized. But can it be said of any of them that the author first got a definite general idea of the whole situation with which the book deals in its deeper sense? Is it not rather true that each plunges at once into detail, and into word for word exposition of the deeper meaning?

It may be answered that Swedenborg does the same thing. He proceeds in much the same manner in the "Arcana," and in the two works on the Apocalypse. Our collateral discussions only imitate him. But that is at least very doubtful. For the Book of *Revelation* he has not only seized in his own mind on the general theme, but states it at the outset, and also in the course of his exposition in occasional summaries of chapters and groups of chapters. As for the "Arcana" no close student of that masterfully arranged work can fail to note that, though he has not said so, the Revelator has, in his mind's eye, assembled *Genesis*, or its deeper sense, as a story of the Lord's progressive glorification of His humanity, while *Exodus*, and its spiritual meaning, he grasped in the aggregate as a story of the redemption which the Lord worked while in the world. Those general conceptions of the deeper contents of the two books dominate interpretation in detail. Even from the "Prophets and Psalms," and its summary interpretation of verses and groups of verses, the student intent on it can deduce the general situation in reference to which interpretation went forward in any one book. We have not begun to lift out and study and appreciate the methods of exposition which Swedenborg practised, and which lie imbedded in his actual product. Still less have we imitated the procedure from generals to details and back into generals. Rev. John Worcester's "Matthew" was a departure from the word for word procedure of most of our collateral literature, and gives a connected and coherent setting forth of the deeper meaning, yet even in that compact and suggestive study there is not first the attempt to bring into view the general significance of the book in its deeper meaning.

Mr. Worcester took with convincing strength and sweep one

initial step in this more tenable procedure, however, in another study, the suggestive last chapter of his "The Bread of Life." For if we are going to bring our general fact and situation before us first, and then build it out with detail, and so arrive at both comprehensiveness and detail, with mutually reinforcing accuracy in each, then one of the first steps, and quite the boldest of all, is to sweep the spiritual sense of the Scripture as a whole as he does admirably in the chapter of the book referred to. Unless one has this general story of the inner meaning before him and in thought, as the inner meaning runs from *Genesis* to *Revelation*, how shall he know where and how *Joel*, for instance, lets into that general story, and what in general that particular prophecy is about? There may be, and undoubtedly is, a possible induction from detail to the general theme; but we also need the other and larger approach, for good workmanship, and for fuller result. The way lies open here not only to a renewal of study in the Church in the inner meaning of Scripture; that study has not been active as it used to be. The way lies open to a broader and therefore more commanding kind of study in this field.

It will also be found that when this larger way of entering on the spiritual meaning of any book of the Word is tried, that another way of handling the sense of the letter becomes natural and pertinent. The writer again thinks it is true to say of our collateral literature in the field of exposition of the spiritual sense that a knowledge of the sense of the letter hardly enters into the procedure. In most of them only the text of the Bible book has been necessary, and the procedure has been to give key-words, or certain words anyway, their spiritual significance in a kind of employment of a dictionary of correspondences. But one of the first aids to a view of the general spiritual sense of a book, is to master its message in the sense of the letter. Let the situation to which the prophecy of *Amos* addresses itself in the sense of the letter be re-constructed in imagination, and the parallel situation in the enduring spiritual life of the individual and of the race begins to come together. Let the message of the book to the historical situation assume its actual outlines and force and depth, and the general message of the

deeper meaning begins to emerge by parallel. The procedure in getting at the spiritual sense as suggested here will be a full-bodied employment of the whole Scripture, and will have that added weight in commending its results. Those results emerge from the whole Scripture, comprehensively taken into account, and worked with.

There is not a single volume in our literature of exposition of the spiritual sense to illustrate this procedure by. There is no use asking for a sample. But the real point is that there will never be such a sample unless we bring into view first of all the method which will result in such work. We need to discuss far more than we do methods in the execution of our various mental efforts. We need to search out, and bring into sight, and put on the table, and overhaul underlying questions, both of method and of supposition or premise, in any number of our intellectual tasks. The convincingness of our case on so many heads does not lie in the result only, but in the validity with which the inquirer sees our method is endowed, or in the comprehensiveness of it, and in the workmanship of it.

William F. Wunsch.

CURRENT LITERATURE

A NEW COMMENTARY ON LUKE*

Material for New Testament study has grown so rapidly in recent years that a New Testament book will bear fresh commentary, to embody new results of textual and other study. Especially has evidence for textual study grown. Dr. Easton, who is the Professor of the Interpretation and Literature of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York City, has drawn on the increased resources of both criticism and exegesis. Unlike most commentaries, his does not reproduce the book being commented on (his references are to the American Revised Version); without the inclusion of the Gospel itself his commentary is already a large book, of 370 pages. Yet it leaves it a little less convenient to have to turn to a separate volume for the Scripture commented on.

Dr. Easton emphasizes interpretation, bringing all available means to bear to re-create in the reader's thought the sense and message with which the Gospel of *Luke* went out. His critical studies he usually sets off in a smaller type. He takes for granted the Two Document theory of the growth of the Gospel, that it is based on *Mark* and on a document common to *Matthew* and *Luke*. His critical studies bear out this general view. He finds a third written source utilized by the author of the Gospel, and has some interesting things to say in characterization of the re-writing which the author does on his sources. While the Gospel is written by a Gentile for Gentiles, he calls attention to the fact that it is not so clearly Gentile in interest and emphasis as is commonly thought.

**The Gospel According to St. Luke;* a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By Burton Scott Easton, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926. 407 pp., 8vo. $3.50.

It is in Lk. that the centurion dares to approach Christ only through Jewish intermediaries (7:3-5), and it is Lk.'s version of the eschatological discourse that has nothing to say about Gentile salvation (21:13, 24f).

The evidence that Lk. was a Gentile lies in his omission of technically Jewish details (e. g., Mk. 7:1-23), the vagueness of his references to Palestinian geography, and his misunderstandings of Jewish law (6:1) or thought (12:4, contrast Mt. 10:28).

The Introduction also gives some estimates of existing exegetical and critical literature on the Gospel, and names the chief New Testament MSS cited in the Commentary, whether Greek, Syriac, Latin or Coptic.

One would like to work through the Gospel using the Commentary before expressing any extended opinion on it. Any student of a book of the Bible wants a good commentary or two at hand, whether he is making sure of the text, of the historical sense, or of the deeper meaning. Certainly this commentary has an advantage over many; it incorporates with Dr. Easton's comment the variant comments of other scholars who occupy representative points of view, critical or exegetical. It is like working simultaneously in the commentaries of M'Neile (on Mt.), Plummer, Zahn, Jülicher, Loisy, and the others who are drawn upon. Throughout there is evidence of long study and painstaking work.

Random turning of pages has been informing. It is enlightening in a general way, and may be revealing on many particular topics to know that at *Luke* x. 32 one has "the only mention of a Levite in the Synoptists." It is something to take into account that the force of a Greek conjunction at xi. 2 indicates that "Lk. understands that the Lord's Prayer should form part of all Christian devotions." I do not recall appreciating (as Dr. Easton notes at xxiii. 34) that "the garments of criminals were the perquisites of the executioner." So in a phrase which Luke uses (but not *Matthew*) in the Lord's Prayer, Dr. Easton finds an instance of the Gentile author's re-writing of sources; for the phrase is difficult to do back into Aramaic, in which language, however, the Lord spoke the Prayer (p. 176). There is a nice and thoroughly worth-while

distinction in interpretation of the disciples' question on the Lord's saying about the rich man and heaven at xviii. 26.

"Then who?" is most naturally taken as, "Who, if the wealthy are rejected?" Such an opinion is common in "popular" theology everywhere, but Rabbinical tradition should not be accused of propagating it. To translate "What rich man?" (Wellhausen), or, "Who, if this model character is rejected?" (Zahn), is arbitrary.

The Bible teacher or minister, wanting a commentary on the third Gospel, would find results to the very recent well wrought into this substantial commentary of Dr. Easton's; the special student of *Luke* will want to add it to whatever books he already has on the Gospel.

WM. F. WUNSCH.

CAN WE STILL BELIEVE?*

Much ado about radio preachers, much reading of popular tractates on a Book and a Man no one but a journalistic Rotarian properly "knows," many union services accompanied by washes of sentiment, much going about doing good—all these signs of the times in the life of "the churches" cannot conceal from the thoughtful the peril in which Christianity today finds itself. There is ground for thinking that an uneasy consciousness of insecure foundations is in back of much of the bustling activity of Social Gospelers and others. When in doubt, resort to pragmatism. The dilettante rector in Miss Sinclair's "A Cure of Souls" facilely dismisses his curate's intellectual difficulties with "There's one cure for this trouble, and that is work—hard work. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. Doing is knowing."

Things are in a serious way. Of course, the degree of "seriousness" is concealed from the faithful by the fact that so few of the doubters are heard from in church circles: the real

**The Reconstruction of Belief.* By CHARLES GORE, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926. 1018 pp., 12mo. $2.75.

sceptics leave. Like the lions in the fable, they paint no pictures; and the *men* who paint, depict the victory as they please. But there remains within the Church agnosticism of varying degree. Anglicanism has to put up as best it can with modernists of all shades, as well as quasi-Romanists.

Many causes have combined to produce the intellectual difficulties which confront young people invited to "believe" and be saved. Chief are the theory of evolution, the "higher criticism" of the Bible, and the study of comparative religions. The first two were perhaps especially damaging to 19th century faith: the last is perhaps the most so today. Everybody today has at least heard of Frazer's "Golden Bough," as everybody in Victoria's reign had heard the dread name of Darwin; and everybody has heard of the resemblances between the mystery religions and Catholicism, between the lives of Buddha and Christ. The conclusion generally drawn is sometimes—as with the theosophists—that all religions are equally right; but most often is deduced the proposition that all are equally fallacious.

The scholars of the Church make specific answer to specific attacks: this alleged charge and that have no doubt somewhere been proved futile. But doubt, like faith, does not proceed by gingerly advances, and is impatient of step by step analysis. It wants some synthetic defence of the faith: it wants assurance that the Christian system can be defended not only in its parts but in and as a whole. There is need, then, from time to time for books which try to state *all* the case for orthodoxy, to put into a coherent system the accumulated prolegomena. Other periods have had such works: Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity" for the 17th century, Bishop Butler's "Analogy" for the 18th, Paley's "Evidences" for the early 19th.

No doubt it is impossible that any contemporary work should be so representative, so summary of the best thought of the time, as the books just mentioned. But if any can be, and if any contemporary Christian scholar can compose such an *Apologia*, the book is "The Reconstruction of Belief," and the author Dr. Gore.

To begin with, the author, Dr. Gore, a man now somewhat over seventy, is (as Dean Inge, by no means sympathetic to him

in thought, has said) the most important man in the Church of England today. Before his retirement to devote all his time to writing and lecturing, he was successively Bishop of Birmingham and Oxford. He holds honorary degrees from Oxford and Cambridge, Edinburgh and Durham, is fellow of colleges in the Universities of Oxford and London, and has held a number of the most celebrated lectureships, including the Bampton. His scholarship is not that of the specialist: his range is too wide. But he is impressively abreast of the times in all his studies; has missed nothing of importance in the technical "literature" of the departments of thought in which he works. His reading is prodigious—in history, theology, Biblical criticism, metaphysics, ethics. He knows the classics and the English poets. Though never hasty or careless, he has been a prolific writer. He has written Biblical commentaries, books on the Eucharist and the Incarnation, a standard book on "Roman Catholic Claims," to mention but a few.

Dr. Gore is associated with the Anglo-Catholic party in the Anglican Church. But he does not seem an extremist today: he is not in sympathy with the Romanizing tendencies in doctrine and ceremonial of some of the younger men. He may be regarded as continuing more than any one else the tone and temper of the Carolinian High-Churchmen and the 19th century Tractarians. He is serious, sober-minded, earnest, English.

In theology and Biblical criticism Dr. Gore again seems today a moderate conservative. Here, as in his churchmanship, he can witness to the change in thought his life-time has witnessed: in his youth he seemed "advanced" in all these departments. The younger Anglo-Catholics combine with their Catholicism what approaches the completely eschatological interpretation of Jesus; Dr. Gore still holds to the intermediate position, the so-called Kenotic theory: Christ "emptied Himself"—"never shows any sign of transcending the knowledge of natural things possible to His age, country, and condition."

Dr. Gore regards neither Old or New Testament as "infallible," "inerrant." He agrees with the "higher criticism" that the early chapters of Genesis are "not historical records, but inspired folk-lore," and that "the subsequent records of the

beginnings of Israel are tradition, and not strict history"; and so on. All he requires to build on is "the solid historical ground of the period of the written prophets. We must assure ourselves, on this solid ground, of the reality of God's self-revelation." Of the New Testament narratives he asks "not for infallibility, but for quite trustworthy history." His cautious conclusion, after examining the evidence for the "historical worth" of the documents is that they can be used "as a whole with confidence in their authenticity and trustworthiness."

"The Reconstruction of Belief" is a reprint in a convenient single volume of three books previously issued separately: "Belief in God" (1921), "Belief in Christ" (1922), and "The Holy Spirit and the Church" (1924). In the series Dr. Gore addresses just the persons who most need his learning and wisdom—the intelligent laymen and parish clergy, who have not the time or perhaps the technical training to pursue profitably the innumerable special studies of Christian scholars, who yet want—and need—a general conspectus of what scholarship has to say *in defensione fidei*. "I endeavor," says Dr. Gore, "to appeal to the ordinary educated reader." Elsewhere he denies the oft-repeated allegation that theology is only for specialists—that the layman must take it on authority. He says:

> It [theology] is not only a matter for specialized experts or professional scholars. The discussion has been left in the past too much to them. Religion, after all, [let no one at this point accuse me of misconstruing Dr. Gore, who is not of those who parade the distinction between religion and theology] is for the common man. It is in the region of the common reason, at least as much as in the circles of specialized study, that it must be judged. This is, most noticeably, the assumption of the New Testament.

"Belief in Christ" is not a study of the evidence for the Deity of Jesus as a study of historic and contemporary Christologies. The chapters constitute (though this is not directly obvious) defences of what Dr. Gore conceives to be the orthodox position against the various misreadings of others. "The Belief of the First Disciples" answers the theories of Harnack, Schweitzer, Bousset, and Kirsopp Lake; "The Apocalyptic Teaching of

Jesus" is, of course, Dr. Gore's answer to the eschatological theories of Schweitzer and Loisy.

The most important chapters in this book are those on the Trinity and the Definitions of the Ecumenical Councils on the person of Christ. In both Dr. Gore summarizes and interprets rather than originates; in both he follows the "best contemporary thought."

The Persons of the Trinity are not *separate:* "There is, it seems, in the three but one being, one mind, one activity." It is true we think of human persons as mutually exclusive. But "this impression . . . is largely derived from the separatedness of human *bodies*. When we get to the spiritual self of a man, we find that personality is radically social and deeply permeable." To this idea of Canon Richmond's, he adds the ideas given expression in Professor Webb's "God and Personality": that the Trinity makes society seem a divine as well as a human necessity (How can God "live and love alone?" "For life, as far as we can see, involves relationship, and rational or moral life the relationship of persons." "Now we can see how God can be alive with the fullest life we can conceive of—will and reason and love—because His own being involves in itself a relationship of persons."); that God is to be thought of not as a Person but as a Being in which subsist Persons.

The chapter on the Councils develops the position of Newman, Tyrrell, and others, that dogmatic definition is not so much positive as negative. For example, the dogma of the Personality of God was intended to exclude any sub-personal interpretation of Deity, not to restrict God. Says Dr. Gore, "The purpose of the dogmas was negative—to exclude certain fundamentally misleading interpretations of the person of Christ." He does believe that "the lines of thought which they were intended to exclude [e.g., Arianism] were really destructive of the foundations of the Christian faith."

"Belief in God" is an *apologia* for theism which covers the ground pretty thoroughly. Dr. Gore is not of those apologists, Anglican and Protestant, who rest their whole case on the ethical life of man. Mrs. Ward's Robert Elsmere declared, "I take my stand on conscience and the moral life." Many have

echoed his words—have found Nature meaningless or evil, but seen in man's sense of duty, his irreducible and irrepressible *ought*, the clue to the reality of the spiritual. Dr. Gore does not take up the purely rationalistic or intellectualistic defence of Roman apologetics. But, characteristically, he combines, accumulates. He adds to the moral proof a modified version of the argument from design and the argument from Beauty. He is conservatively orthodox in his separation of natural and revealed religion. Revelation is necessary to adequate faith. The God of Nature can be but "dimly described. His personality, His character, His purpose" appear "ambiguous."

The argument from revelation implies and necessitates the study of the "historical worth" of Old and New Testaments. Dr. Gore comes to the conclusion that those who reject the supernatural in these books do so not because the books are bad history but because of *a priori* philosophical views. His chapter on the miraculous (The Prejudice Examined) is one of the best pieces of thinking in the whole volume.

Those who sincerely desire to give a reason for the faith that is in them will read this remarkable work, and all Dr. Gore's works, with attention and appreciation. It is a pleasure to the reviewer here to give witness to his own indebtedness, now extending over some years, to this great Christian thinker.

AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D.

"FUNDAMENTALISM VERSUS MODERNISM"

The terms "modernism" and "modernist" in present day usage were probably derived from the documents issued by the Roman Catholic Church during the first decade of the present century in connection with the repressive measures used by it in combating a growing tendency on the part of its clergy to be influenced by "modern thought" in ways dangerous to the stability of doctrinal and ecclesiastical positions of that august body. So dangerous was the infection deemed to be, as voiced by such men as George Tyrrell and Alfred Loisy, that two encyclicals were issued by the Pope about the years 1907 and 1910 respectively, first calling upon the bishops and other high

potentates in that Church to remove from office all teachers voicing modernistic sentiments, and to make a general investigation as to the extent of the contamination, and later requiring the entire body of the clergy and of students for the priesthood to affirm their allegiance to the traditional platform of Catholicism, and to pledge themselves not to read or listen to modernistic statements. Thus that organization officially welded one more reactionary bond upon itself.

The terms "fundamentalism" and "fundamentalist" seem to have been given currency in very considerable measure by that series of twelve paper-bound volumes entitled "The Fundamentals," issued in Chicago from 1910-1915 in the interest of evangelical Christianity, and scattered broadcast among religious workers throughout the English-speaking world, some of the volumes going to over 200,000 addresses. Those who upheld these "fundamentals" were, of course, "fundamentalists"; and all those within orthodox church bodies who denied or rejected more or less of them, and argued against them, were "modernists." In view of the values attached to religious convictions by all earnest people, the presence of conservatives and liberals within the same bodies inevitably meant serious friction, since the former naturally considered the latter disloyal, because contending within the organization against the principles for which that organization stood.

Since the World War the animosity between these two factions has been on the increase, so that the terms "fundamentalist" and "modernist" are now in common use in a generally understood sense as applied to a controversy still waging in Protestantism, and pregnant with ominous possibilities. Indeed, that controversy has now become sufficiently important for a special article to be devoted to it ("Fundamentalism and Modernism," by Prof. Wm. Adams Brown of Union Theological Seminary, New York City) in the three volumes just issued (date of Preface, Sept. 1, 1926) supplementary to the Eleventh and Twelfth Editions of the Encyclopedia Britannica.

Evidently the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy is a matter that every thoughtful person should have some knowledge of; and for balanced judgment he should know something

of both sides. To that end it is probable that the best book now available for the general reader is a volume recently added to that useful set of manuals known as "The Handbook Series," published by the H. W. Wilson Company of New York. This volume is entitled "Fundamentalism versus Modernism"*; and for the most part it consists of selections from esteemed writers on the one side and on the other. It is divided into five parts: I. General (in which "historic and recent creeds" are set forth sufficiently for the purpose of the book, and general statements are made by way of getting an initial point of view); II. The Bible (the old view and the new); III. Science and Religion.—Evolution and the Bible; IV. Miracles, the Virgin Birth, and the Bodily Resurrection; and V. The Position of Modernists in Orthodox Churches. The compiler calls attention to the fact that the doctrines of the Atonement and of the Second Coming of Christ might well have had consideration in the book, and explains their omission on the ground of the focusing of scholarly attention during recent years on other doctrinal subjects. He states that his object was "to give a taste of what is being said on both sides of the controversy" concerning the questions now most under discussion; and he directs those who wish to go more thoroughly into any special phases of the subject, to the works listed in the ample Bibliography with which the book begins, among which are included most of the recognized authorities that are available in English.

For a better understanding of the question what the modern controversy is all about, this book can be heartily recommended. While the thoughtful reader will feel that on the whole the modernists have the better of the argument, he should bear in mind that some of the subjects over which there is contention cannot be proven either way on the basis of mere argumentation.

B. A. Whittemore.

**Fundamentalism versus Modernism.* Compiled by Eldred C. Vanderlaan. New York: H. W. Wilson Co. 1925. 490 pp., 12mo. $2.40. (The Handbook Series.)

PRESENT-DAY APOSTACY

Perhaps to some Fundamentalists* all Modernists, as inspired by the spirit of denial, look alike; but to New-Churchmen, viewing such liberals as constituent parts of Old Church bodies, they are of several kinds, according to the degrees of rejection of "orthodox" essentials, and of approximation to anti-Christian Unitarianism. One of the unfortunate features of religious affiliation through heredity is the fact that in so many instances members of the younger generation, when arriving at their own ripened views, find themselves out of harmony with the religious affirmations of their parents. So, in the Unitarian body, which from the "orthodox" position is not Christian at all, there are doubtless some of sufficient spiritual sensitiveness to be aware of the shortcomings of Unitarianism generally; while at the other extreme there are those whose naturalism is positive irreligion. And in evangelical bodies "modern thought" has so taken possession of many of the hereditary members that they are veritable enemies in the religious households of their fathers. Some of these, while retaining faith in the Divinity of Jesus Christ and the inspiration of the Bible, would reject things which from the New-Church viewpoint ought to be rejected; and in some cases such persons seem to tend towards the New-Church positions. Still others in far larger numbers, look askance at all the "essentials," and (unless going over to naturalism altogether) are virtually Unitarian at heart. It is safe to say that, if the modernists of this type were sufficiently impelled by intellectual honesty to leave organizations in whose credal foundations they no longer believe, and to ally themselves with like-minded people elsewhere, the Unitarian organization would grow by leaps and bounds.

---

*The significance of this term applies to those adherents of evangelical Protestantism who earnestly uphold such positions as the "five points" affirmed by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1910, and reaffirmed in 1923, as "essential doctrines of the Christian faith: the Virgin Birth, the physical Resurrection, the inerrancy of Scripture, the substitutionary Atonement, and belief in the Miracles." Fundamentalists of some other bodies emphasize the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, or other credal platforms.

The essentials of "orthodox" Christianity rest upon grounds that every man of active intellect is likely at times to have some doubts about, whether expressed or not. So, too, the worldly-minded. Church affiliation is so largely a matter of heredity and of mass psychology that every congregation has sceptics among its members. If open in expressing their views, or in standing with spokesmen of like mind, they constitute in our own day a part of the disturbing modernist group. They tend to infect those bodies like leaven, and to foster the growth of infidelity. But for heredity in religious affiliation, the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy would not have arisen.

Worldliness and mammon-worship in all its aspects, as well as "modern thought" and the scientific spirit* of our age, tend to such disbelief in Christian essentials; not that such "essentials" can be disproved, but they can be denied and rejected. As respectability is still enhanced by church membership, and as worldly people who have wealth and social ambition crave respectability, and as such persons are usually not over-conscientious, they are rather numerous in many Christian organizations. And they are likely to have positions on executive committees, sometimes in considerable numbers; and they frequently shape the controlling sentiment of such committees. Such as they are those who are characterized by the author before us as Sadducees.

A century ago persons of this type in the Congregational Churches of New England, by trickily taking advantage of the function of parishes in the selection of ministers for the societies established by our Puritan forefathers, were able to install Unitarian clergymen over those societies, and to get possession of the church property and funds in the resulting disruption. In this way the Unitarian societies of New England were established. The predominance of such persons in the governing body of Harvard College a century and more ago resulted in making the Harvard Divinity School the training-school for

*In his "The Belief in God and Immortality," Prof. J. H. Leuba of Bryn Mawr states that "disbelief in a personal God and in personal immortality is directly proportional to abilities making for success in the sciences."

Unitarian ministers; and by legislative enactment the overseers secured modifications in the constitution and by-laws of the College so as to perpetuate Unitarian control forever. Since then, and especially of recent decades, the subtle influence of directors of that type (what our author calls "the leaven of the Sadducees") in many theological schools established and endowed for the perpetuation of evangelical Christianity, has resulted in the more or less total perversion of those institutions from the purposes for which they were founded.

The story of the infection of American Protestantism in the manner thus indicated makes up the larger part of the remarkable volume before us: "The Leaven of the Sadducees; or, "Old and New Apostacies,"* by Ernest Gordon. The cover jacket calls it "the greatest broadside against Liberalism that has been put out in this generation"; and it states that it was

> Written especially for the information of Ministers, Trustees of institutions, Fundamentalist leaders, Editors of the religious press, Teachers in seminaries, training schools, and colleges; and Christian laymen who are not informed of the real situation.

The title-page bears the following two significant mottoes:

> We trust the Unitarian doctrine and practice to leaven the inert mass of archaic religious opinion. The penetration has been accomplished, and the leaven has worked wonderfully.—"Twentieth Century Christianity," Charles W. Eliot.
>
> Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.—*Acts* 20:30.

Those texts sound the key-note of the entire treatise before us. All the chapters (except the last) show how the infection is being spread—how the "permeation" (a term much loved by some of our own people) is being promoted—how the insidious work has been and is being done. The chapter entitled "The Looting of Andover" furnishes a specific example, showing how that embryo institution was developed in the interests of evangelical Congregationalism after Harvard went over to

---

**The Leaven of the Sadducees;* or, Old and New Apostacies. By Ernest Gordon. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Assn. 1926. 263 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.50; paper, $1.00.

Unitarianism, and how, following various steps in perversion, the younger institution was so corrupted as to consent to a marriage with its anti-Christian lover, only to have the merger finally annulled (wonderful to say) by the courts. The chapter on "The Apostate Seminaries," instancing the Union Theological Seminary of New York, the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, the Newton Theological Institution, the Rochester Theological Seminary, the Chicago Theological Seminary, the Oberlin School of Theology, the Boston University School of Theology, and others in less detailed ways, shows these important institutions so saturated with "the assured results of modern scholarship" as to be among those which the author abundantly demonstrates to be apostate to "orthodox" Christianity.

How has the apostacy been brought about?

Loyalty to truth as those of the modernist type see it, coupled with the Jesuitical principle of the end justifying the means, exonerates them in their own minds from anything dishonorable in retaining membership in, and in endeavoring to transform, the religious bodies with which they are hereditarily associated. And they sometimes go about it after plotting together with those of like mind, to devise a definite plan to effect it. For instance, we find the following matter presented in a footnote on p. 238 of the volume before us, as quoted from Dr. Harold Paul Sloan's "The New Infidelity and the New Reformation":

> Within six months in a preachers' meeting in the East a statement was made by a man of prominence in Methodism whose word would be generally accepted if we should publish his name, that twenty-five years ago a group of men met in Boston and agreed together to work for the liberalizing of the Methodist church. He pointed out that their procedure should be along the following lines:
>
> First, the putting of a chair of English Bible taught by a man of rationalist sympathies in the various colleges of Methodism;
>
> Second, liberalizing the Book Concern;
>
> Third, liberalizing of the ritual;
>
> Fourth, liberalizing of the Course of Study.
>
> Bishop Neeley intimates that this program is being worked out. He writes:

"If a fraction of the current statements on this point are correct, there is an anti-Methodist school of thought working through a few aggressive individuals to compel the church to accept its views, and at the present time to accomplish this without constitutionally changing the Articles of Religion or other standards of doctrine. The method is not of the open and frontal attack, but of the sapper and miner.

"One way is, to reach and mis-teach the more than four million of children and young people in the Sunday schools through Sunday-school literature. If they can do that for a few years, even five, they will indoctrinate these millions. The few who are manipulating these matters are strategists of no mean order, and they mean, if they can, to revolutionize doctrinal Methodism. They are the reds inside the church.

"Another way is to produce and have spread with the imprint of the church publishing-house, denominational literature containing anti-Methodist teaching which the general and loyal membership will buy and read, supposing that, as it comes from the church, it must be sound.

"Another way, but in the course of a few years a very influential way, is to slip into professors' chairs in various institutions men who both believe and promote anti-Methodist thought. In this way the school-men and educated classes are to be reached, and the literary and scientific institutions will send out every year their hundreds of graduates, a more or less percentage of whom will spread the un-Methodist instruction they have received.

"Then as a way of controlling the incoming ministry, the Course of Study is to be changed by throwing out sound and standard Methodist books, and introducing those that cannot make true ministers.

"And now it looks like an effort to control the general membership and the congregations by a revised ritual.

"Nothing seems to have been overlooked by this little company of designers, and if this goes on for a few years more, the most disastrous consequences must follow."

In view of the above, it seems well to quote another paragraph from Mr. Gordon's book (p. 208):

"I am not afraid," wrote John Wesley, "that the people called Methodist should ever cease to exist in Europe or America, but I am afraid lest they should exist as a dead sect having the form of religion without the power. If ever Methodism is overthrown, it will be at the hands of her scholars who neither believe her doctrines nor practise her polity. These are the unreasonable men from whom it must purge itself or fall by its own weight"; and the Methodist bishops in 1840 expressed their doubts as to the expediency of establishing schools of divinity. "The history of such institutions admonishes us that the speculators of human science have but too frequently obscured and adulterated

the doctrines of the revelation of God, and that in many cases where these have been commenced on evangelical ground they have wandered into the dark regions of 'rational Christianity.'"

Other evidence of insidious plotting, and of the effective carrying out of such plots, is given elsewhere in Mr. Gordon's book. For instance, in the chapter entitled "Unitarian Skepticism and Unitarian Schemes," where he calls attention to recent efforts to alter the basis of active membership in the Y. W. C. A., he reports one woman as saying:

"I want to quote what was said in my presence a few months ago by one of our leaders. A person of prominence in one of our large institutions in the Middle west, *a Unitarian, said to him, 'Ten years ago we set out to capture the large universities of the land, and we have practically done it; and now we are setting about to capture the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A.'*"

Mr. Gordon then goes on to ask:

What is the motive back of this continual drive to get into the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Federal Council of Churches, and other organizations of American Christianity? The answer is fairly given by a Unitarian editor:

"*Our doctrines are especially good for budding and grafting on older stock.* If the name is sometimes repellant, the substance when transplanted and allowed to spread by inoculation has a wonderful power of expansion. We are sometimes astonished to see how our position on the virgin birth, miracles, etc., has been incorporated into the body of an old faith. To be sure *these new and vigorous branches are of a nature to render the remainder of the tree of but little value.* . . . We should frankly confess that our unadulterated doctrine, *the honest truth frankly uttered,* does not appeal to the masses; but when a strong flavor of it appears in an old stock, it is often welcomed with enthusiasm. Then it appears under the enticing name of liberalism.

"The Unitarian body is constantly grafting new thought, purpose, and method on the older churches. . . . *By indirection a large part of the finest and subtlest work is accomplished.* . . . *The purpose of its very existence is to widen the area of liberal thought by a movement without which the old churches might have fossilized.* . . . No great landslide from the old ranks as was once predicted has taken place; but it is one thing to tear down a structure with tremendous noise and dust, and another to transform it vitally, or to assist the spirit of the age in this great work." (*Christian Register*, 1910:339.)

The figure of the leaven and the lump in this connection is

commonly used by Unitarian leaders. For instance, Dr. E. A. Horton, in his work on "Unitarianism," asks: "What could Unitarianism hope to achieve?" And he answers: "To permeate other churches with liberal tendencies . . . to leaven the lump of modern Christianity." He then quotes Dr. Putnam as saying: "Unitarianism considered as a lump is very small, but considered as a leaven it is vast and omnipresent. As an organism it is feeble; as an influence it is irresistible." When clergymen of "orthodox" churches become thoroughly infected with Unitarian views, and make that fact known to the leaders of Unitarianism, they are advised to remain where they are. "It is strategic to remain and work from the inside. Many others are doing it successfully, and the gradual permeation of the orthodox denominations with liberal ideas disseminated by trusted leaders of their own appears to them the best procedure." (Gordon, pp. 94-95.)

While Unitarians did not originate the Religious Education Association, they have been among its most active members in promoting the radicalism for which it stands. Of this Association Mr. Gordon says:

> That the Religious Education Association, with its Jews and Unitarians, its Leubas and Starbucks, should actually be engaged in drawing up a religious-education scheme for the Christian institutions of the country is perhaps the last word in effrontery. (P. 129.)
>
> The reports of the Association overflow with radical utterances. . . . One would have to hunt long through the twenty-three arid volumes of reports to find a gracious and loyal word about Christ. I must confess that I have not come across one.
>
> The Association definitely renounces fresh organization. Its plan is to advise and co-operate with existing ones. This means the conscious and systematic infiltration of the institutions of the church with the opinions which the Association really stands for, even though it disavow allegiance to any particular school of thought. The channels for this canalization have been dug in every direction. Commissions and councils and committees of great variety have been set for the devising and execution of programs. The whole Sunday-school system of America is to be transformed. "Fifteen years ago a group of men, chief among whom was President W. R. Harper, saw that the hope of success for the great reconstruction movement in religion and theology then imminent lay in the oncoming generation. The Sunday school, which up to

that time had received small attention from such men, assumed at once a new significance as furnishing the natural medium for inculcating new formulations of old truths." . . . To this end the *Constructive Course of Bible Lessons* (28 vols.) has come from the University of Chicago, and the *Graded Series of the Bible Study Union* (Scribners). *The Blakeslee Bible Study Union Lessons* are edited under similar auspices, Messrs. Kent, Coe, Sanders, and Horr being the Board of Consulting Editors. (Pp. 102-3.)

That the Religious Education Association has from the first aimed at the Sunday schools of the nation is clear enough. President King of Oberlin writes: "It (the R.E.A.) could not wisely undertake the publishing of Sunday-school courses because . . . it would surely cut itself off from the much larger task of suggestion, of guidance, and of cooperation concerning all their varied agencies and interests. (P. 105.)

Mr. Athearn's [Dean of the Boston University School of Religious Education] point of view can be perhaps gathered from his commendation of the Beacon Series (Unitarian) of the Sunday School Lessons as "the best in the world, those of the University of Chicago being second." (*Christian Register,* 1911:472.) . . . *The Christian Register* (Unitarian) calls Drs. Cope, Weigle and Athearn "the hope of the children of America" (1922:415). (*Ibid.*)

We should not be unmindful of the fact that some of our own ministers have been so impressed with the excellence(?) of the Sunday-school text-books that represent the work of such experts as we have been considering, that they have recommended them for adoption by our own Sunday-School Association.

Mr. Gordon's book presents a truly amazing story; and it abounds in evidence for his contentions. Evidently evangelical Christianity is sorely infected with the deadening virus of liberalism. If the tendency were not so strongly towards anti-Christian Unitarianism, and the naturalism that is still worse, and if we could see any rays of spiritual hope in that Unitarianism and that naturalism, we might view the whole movement as nothing but a huge vastating process. But as there seems to be no hope of a spiritual awakening among persons confirmed in liberalism and naturalism, we ought to be deeply concerned in these insidious attacks upon what at its best has very great spiritual value, in spite of all the traditional error that we see mixed up with the truths it is cherishing. In this storm and

stress period, our sympathies ought to be very much with "orthodoxy."

But there is one chapter of hope in the book before us,—the last one, entitled "Modernist Antiques, or the Old and the New Enlightenment," in which Mr. Gordon points out how the modern radicalism but duplicates the attacks upon religion that the free-thinkers of the eighteenth century made, to such effect at that time that apparently by far the larger part of the educated people of Europe had no religious faith worth mentioning. Then came Methodism in England and elsewhere, and Evangelicism in Germany and elsewhere, ushering in a new era of spiritual teaching. The concluding paragraph of the text of Mr. Gordon's book reads as follows:

> The old rationalism is under a new name rearing its head again. It is aiming at nothing less than the perversion of the entire institutional life of American Christianity. It has up to the present worked quietly, and its successes have been both notable and shameful. They may be still more remarkable in the near future. But only for a time. Those who are disconcerted and alarmed by this unlooked-for development will find reassurance in the history of the Christian renascence which followed the eighteenth century. Prof. Troeltsch has to record that "the English, Swiss and German revival period created in the Protestant churches *a mighty counter-current which ended with the complete expulsion of the Enlightenment Theology*" . . . So will it be with us. When the outlook seems most discouraging we are to look for great manifestations of God's power.
>
> " . . . . . O Wind,
> If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?"

Let us note this prediction, and be mindful of the opportunity that will be ours as the new day dawns. From the facts presented in the book, it would seem to be a logical inference that for the greatest ultimate effect our missionary efforts should be directed towards influencing Christian teachers everywhere, who are being spiritually undermined by the pernicious permeation that is going on. Those of rationalist inclinations doubtless will not listen to what we have to say; but those who have any spirituality will often lend an ear to the right word, if we can say it; and in some cases they will eagerly

heed the hand pointing towards salvation for themselves and their loved ones.

Finally, we should not be unmindful of the fact that the permeating leaven spoken of in this book has infected our own body to some extent; and that we need to be on our guard as to how far such leaven shall be allowed to work unchecked. Especially should we be on our guard against those who would minimize amongst us the authority of Swedenborg (who was taught by the angels and the Lord, and who had available for his instruction the combined earthly memories of all who had passed into the spiritual world before him), and who would emphasize in place of his teachings the "assured results" and the "expert opinions" of modern scholarship.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

¶ A cheap, well illustrated and concise life of Emanuel Swedenborg.
¶ Suitable for the use of all the Societies and Missionary Institutions of the Church.

The MISSIONARY AND TRACT SOCIETY of London begs to announce the republication of the

"LIFE OF SWEDENBORG"

By the late J. Stuart Bogg. Revised by Rev. H. G. Drummond.
5 x 7½ inches; 40 pages and paper cover; 15 illustrations.
Price Threepence, postage extra, (say 10c. postpaid).
Order of NEW-CHURCH PRESS, Ltd.,
1, Bloomsbury Street, London, W. C. 1, England

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 516 N. Eutaw St.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 46 Forest Ave., E.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
New York, N. Y. Amer. Swedenborg Printing and Pub. Soc., 16 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 3741 Windsor Place.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

Bath. New-Church Book Room, Green St.
London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

CLARENCE W. BARRON, *President*,
GEORGE C. WARREN,
JAMES E. YOUNG, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.